

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. V, 1.

WHOLE NO. 17.

I.—ON THE ELEGIES OF MAXIMIANUS.

Among the Latin poems, mostly insignificant enough, which have come down to us from the sixth century of the Christian era, the love elegies of Maximianus, 686 lines in all, deserve prominent mention, whether for the general excellence of the metre or for the peculiar experience of the author as a lover. Maximianus gives us his own history. He was by birth a Tuscan, if we may interpret in that sense two passages V 5, 40, cf. I 59. His youth was spent at Rome, where he became known as an adept in all the fashionable amusements then in vogue.

Si libuit celeres arcu intentare sagittas
Occubuit telis praeda petita meis.
Si placuit canibus densos circumdare saltus
Prostravi multas non sine laude feras.
Dulce fuit madidam si fors uersare palaestram
Implicui ualidis lubrica membra toris.
Nunc agili cursu cunctos anteire solebam
Nunc tragici cantus exsuperare melo.

He swam the Tiber in winter, went bare-headed in any extremes of weather, needed little food or sleep, and could on occasion be a hard drinker. He was distinguished as a speaker and a poet. He was, moreover, handsome, and attracted the eyes of the Roman ladies as he passed through the streets.

Ibam per mediam uenali¹ corpore Romam
Spectandus cunctis undique uirginibus.

¹ A passage which to readers of the Greek Anthology might suggest that he was also called Antonius (*uenalis*, ὀνικός, A. P. XI 181).

He was in consequence sought as a son-in-law by many families of distinction; and for a time occupied the peculiar position of a *sponsus generalis* or universal suitor. Nature, however, had made him cold, and unable to find a consort that satisfied his fastidious requirements, he remained unmarried. If, however, he could not fix upon a wife, he has left on record the names of three women who successively occupied his affections. The first of these was named Aquilina; she seems to have been his earliest passion, before he knew what love was, and while he was still suffering from the consciousness of sheepishness, or as he himself calls it, *rusticity*. Their intimacy was watched by the governor (or *pedagogus*) of Maximianus and the mother of Aquilina, and led to the not uncommon result of furtive meetings. Then, Aquilina, severely beaten by her parent, and inflamed with a passion which blows had raised to frenzy, flies to her lover, points to the marks of her beating, and, making a merit of her sufferings, throws herself on his affection. Maximianus, equally inflamed, grows pale and thin, and at last rouses the solicitude of his friend Boetius, perhaps the celebrated minister of Theodoric, the author of the *de Consolatione philosophiae*.

Hic mihi magnarum scrutator maxime rerum,
Solus, Boeti, fers miseratus opem.

Boetius implores him to confess the cause of his melancholy; Maximianus' only reply is an eloquent silence, accompanied by some sign, perhaps a blush, which his friend at once knows how to interpret. 'I understand,' Boetius replies; 'have no fears, the strength of your feelings will be your justification.' Then Maximianus falls at his feet and with tears confesses all. Boetius advises him to gratify his passion, and is told 'duty forbids.' Upon this the philosopher, breaking into a laugh, urges him to be a little bolder; then bribes the parents to connive at, and even encourage the affair. Maximianus is now free to make love openly, but his passion in losing its secrecy has lost its interest; he ceases to care for Aquilina, and takes leave of her with the truly Christian, though somewhat unfeeling, reflection: 'Hail, holy virginity, and ever remain intact; I will do nothing to cause thee shame.'

Maximianus' next love was one Candida, an expert cymbal-player and dancer. She dwelt in his fancy, he tells us, day and night; even in her absence he would talk as if she were with him, and repeat the songs she most affected. His fondness betrayed itself by alternate redness and pallor; it actually disturbed his sleep. On

one occasion when he lay asleep near Caudida's father on the grass, he was heard repeating her name. Startled by the familiar sound, the father gropes his way to the quarter where he supposes his daughter to be. Finding only Maximianus heavily snoring in utter unconsciousness, he moralizes on the perplexing phenomena of dreams, and, attentively listening to the half-obsured sounds which the dreamer lets fall, elicits the secret of his passion. We are left to infer that it was discontinued in consequence; as Maximianus abruptly quits the subject with the remark, 'Thus it was that I, a man of reputed decorum, was betrayed by evidence drawn from myself.'

Some time, it would seem, after this he was sent as ambassador to Constantinople to negotiate a peace between the East and West.

Missus ad Eoas legati munere partes
 Tranquillum cunctis nectere pacis opus,
 Dum studeo gemini componere foedera regni
 Inueni cordis bella nefanda mei.

Here the artifices of a Greek woman, possibly the hostess in whose house he lodged, diverted his attention from diplomacy to love. Like another Ulysses, listening to the voice of the siren, he found himself hurried upon the rocks and shoals of a passion which Greek blandishments made peculiarly seductive to his Tuscan temperament.

Succubui, fateor, Graiae tunc nescius artis,
 Succubui Tusca simplicitate senex.

His advancing years, however, soon brought a disastrous termination to this affair, and the Elegies conclude with the same complaints of the miseries of old age with which they open and which form the dominant note of the whole collection.

The three amours above mentioned appear to succeed each other in chronological order; but Maximianus mentions besides a Lycoris with whom he lived for many years in undivided attachment, though age at last produced reciprocal indifference and ultimate separation. This woman is the first he speaks of; it seems probable from the terms in which she is described,

En dilecta mihi nimium formosa Lycoris
 Cum qua mens eadem, res fuit una mihi.
 Post multos quibus indiuisi uiximus annos
 Respuit amplexus heu pavefacta meos.

that her connexion with him began earlier than any of the others, except probably Aquilina, and perhaps survived them all.

Short, and nowadays almost unknown, as these Elegies are, they merit, I think, more attention than they have usually received. The charge of grossness, it is true, must be freely admitted against them; but this they share with many other poems which every scholar reads. Nor can they be fairly arraigned on the ground either of language or metre, for the language, with very few exceptions (which Rönisch's *Itala und die Vulgata* will generally explain), is pure; and the metre is ordinarily far in advance of the declining sense of prosody at that time current. It might, too, have been expected that a series of love poems belonging, as these probably do, to the age of Theodoric, and in which so eminent a name as Boetius figures prominently, would have had some interest for those whose researches in history, language, or morals have led them to study the writers of that period. Indeed, the contempt into which they have now fallen is mainly the growth of the last two centuries; there was a time when they were widely read and signally influenced literature. One instance will suffice. The 19th Sonnet of Shakespere begins with these verses:

Devouring Time, blunt thou the lion's paws,
And make the earth devour her own sweet brood.
Pluck the keen teeth from the fierce tiger's jaws.

which are, to say the least, very like Maxim. I 271, 2,

Fracta diu rabidi conpescitur ira leonis
Lentaque per senium Caspia tigris erit.

If, on the other hand, we look for the attestation of professed philologists, it will be enough to mention the names of Nicolas Heinsius and Caspar Barth, each of whom has recorded his judgment of the considerableness of our poet, the latter by often referring to him, the former by numerous emendations of his corrupt text.

It is, I believe, owing to one of those accidents of literature, which seem so unimportant and determine so much, that the Elegies of Maximianus have fallen into almost complete oblivion. In the last years of the 15th century, when Alexander Borgia was Pope, two Italians, Pomponio Gaurico, a native of the small town Gifoni, near Salerno, and Giovanni Battista Ramusio, a Venetian, somewhat younger, if we may trust the dates of Fontanini, were pursuing their studies as brother undergraduates in the University of Padua.

Both possessed literary tastes; Gaurico, still a student under the age of 19, composed Latin poems, which may be read in a little volume printed, with a preface by his brother, at Venice in 1526, and which would do no discredit to an English undergraduate of our own century. Ramusio afterwards became famous as one of the earliest collectors of voyages. Latin poetry was a favorite pursuit with the Italians of that time; Gaurico read the Elegies of Maximianus in some one of the numerous MSS in which they are preserved, was struck by their general excellence, and was led to examine them more minutely. The hero of them, he observed, was a Tuscan by birth, an orator, a poet, a votary of Bacchus; he was sent to the East as *legatus*, and he loved a woman named Lycoris. In all these points there was a close coincidence between the Elegies and the recorded history of the famous poet Cornelius Gallus, the friend of Virgil, the ill-starred suitor of Lycoris, the hero of the tenth Eclogue. Besides, Gallus had been sent to Egypt as prefect of Augustus, and might therefore be described as *Missus ad Eoas legati munere partes*, and fragments of his orations were preserved by Servius and Quintilian. Gaurico leapt to the conclusion that the Elegies were the genuine production of Gallus; a conclusion in which, we must needs believe, Ramusio had a share, even if we hesitate to accuse the two friends of a deliberate conspiracy to deceive, as Fontanini and Wernsdorf suppose. However this may be, in 1501 Gaurico published at Venice *Cornelii Galli Fragmenta*, in other words the Elegies of Maximianus, of course omitting the distich containing the real author's name,

Atque aliquis cui caeca foret bene nota uoluptas
Cantat; cantantem Maximianus amat.

and ending up his performance with these commendatory words by Ramusio: 'Reader, that you have read these remains of the poet Corn. Gallus, be grateful to that best of youths, Pomponius Gauricus,' as well as an epigram, also by Ramusio, congratulating the Roman poet on his suicide being at least partially unsuccessful.

Of the genuine Elegies of that great poet, in homage to whom Virgil describes the whole choir of Phoebus as rising from their seats, and to whose unhappy passion for Lycoris he has consecrated the noblest of his Eclogues, one pentameter alone survives in the Commentary of Servius. Nor did this fact escape the penetration of Gaurico's contemporaries. Petrus Crinitus, in his work on the Latin Poets (II 42), published in 1505, noticed the new discovery

only to condemn it; Marius Niger, a Venetian commentator on Ovid's *Amores*, pronounced the work an impudent forgery, which proved its author to lack discernment, perhaps money. Lilius Gyraldus denounced Gaurico as a shameless madman, and pointed out that neither the name of the author nor the old age he so emphatically dwells upon,¹ nor the cast of the language, nor the licences of the metre were in accordance with Gaurico's theory; adding, however (to us a strange reservation), that he would not deny one or two elegies might be genuine; a view which was also held by Julius Caesar Scaliger (Font. p. 52).

The mischief, however, had been done; edition after edition appeared in which the sixth century Elegies of Maximianus were ascribed to the Augustan poet Cornelius Gallus, and often added as an appendix to Catullus Tibullus and Propertius; this, too, though two editions containing the real author's name had preceded Gaurico's, before the end of the 15th century. Theodore Poelman (Pulmannus) was the first to restore the true name in his Antwerp edition of the three *Erotici*, 1569, stating at the same time that the ascription to Gallus was false. But his example was only partially followed; and the frolic or mistake of an Italian student of 19 was perpetuated as late as the Bipontine edition of 1786.

It is this unfortunate accident, I believe, and not so much the intrinsic immorality of Maximianus, which has condemned him. It has always been and it is at the present day the fashion of scholars, when denouncing a forgery, to heap abuse and ridicule on the work with which the forger has been busied. Such a course is no doubt made imperative by the conditions of literature; but it sometimes does injustice. Maximianus, as soon as he was discovered not to be Gallus, was found to be wholly without merit and denounced as a *nugator* and *nebulo*; the offense of Gaurico was transferred to the innocent object of his ingenuity. Such a verdict could not, of course, affect the judgment of a Pithou or a Heinsius; but to the reading public at large the *Elegies*, because they had once been ascribed to the wrong author, were stamped with the brand of detected forgery thenceforward.

It is time to say something of the actual form in which this ill-fated bantling of the Muses has been transmitted to posterity. It is found in many MSS, some of the best of which have been collated by Bährens, in the last volume of his *Poetae Latini Minores*. The

¹ Gallus killed himself at the age of 43. Hieronym.

earliest, perhaps the best of these, is at Eton; it is a MS of the 11th century, written in Lombard character, and containing besides Maximianus, the Eclogae of Theodulus, the Achilleis of Statius, Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* with part of the *Heroides*, and Arator. This MS I have myself collated in the *Heroides* and Maximianus; Mr. Shuckburgh has published its readings in the *Heroides*, Dr. Karl Schenkl in the *Achilleis*. The Elegies of Maximianus are without inscription. Bährens ranks with this a *Reginensis* in the Vatican of the 11th, a *Riccardianus* at Florence of the 12th century. I have myself collated four English MSS, two in the Bodleian, two in the British Museum. The Bodleian MSS are labelled respectively Bodl. 38 and Auct. 5, 6. The former, which has been minutely examined by Mr. F. Madan, is a very small MS written seemingly in the 11th or 12th century. It belonged in the 16th century to Pierre Daniel, in the 17th to Nicolas Heinsius, at the sale of whose collection in 1682 it was bought by Edward Bernard, and was purchased for the Bodleian in 1697. Unhappily the MS is imperfect, I 1-54, III 2-IV 59 having been torn away; a loss deplorable on all accounts, as it is one of the best existing copies of the work. Auct. 5, 6 is dated by Mr. Macray 1250-1300; it contains Avianus and several other Latin poems. A different but early hand has written in the margin opposite the first lines of El. I, a prefatory introduction, which ends with the following words: *titulus aliter est hic Incipit liber Maximiani de miseriis et de fragilitate humane uite*, from which we may conclude that the title varied in different MSS, a supposition quite borne out, as I shall show, by facts. Of the two British Museum MSS, one, belonging to the King's Library (15 A vii), is exhibited in the new edition of Bährens. It is a beautifully written codex of the later 13th century, with large capitals brilliantly executed in red or blue, as well as scrolls, to mark sections or divisions in the poems. I counted 17 of these, I 1 *Emula*, 63 *Ibam*, 145 *Si libros repeto*, 227 *Suscipe me genitrix*; II 1 *En dilecta mihi*, 17 *Heu quid longa dies*; III 5 *Captus amore tuo*, 47 *Hinc mihi magnarum scrutator maxime rerum*, 71 *Interea donis*; IV 1 *Gestat* (sic) *adhuc*, 7 *Uirgo fuit*, 53 *Hoc etiam meminisse iuuat*; V 1 *Missus ad Eoas*, 55 *Erubui stupuique*, 87 *Mentula festorum*, 105 *Hanc ego cum lacrimis*; VI 1 *Claude precor miseras*. This MS is highly instructive as to the prevailing conception of Maximianus in the middle ages. Far from being treated as a licentious writer never to be put in the hands of the young, he was classed with Cato, the

supposed author of the Moral Distichs, Theodulus, and the fable-writer Avianus, as a teacher of ethics. The Brit. Mus. MS which contains the four writers in the above-mentioned order adds at the end of each of them *Explicit primus liber de moribus s. catho*, *Explicit secundus liber de moribus s. theodulus*, *Explicit tertius liber de moribus s. auianus*, *Explicit quartus liber ethicorum s. maximianus*. It is strange enough to find a work, parts of which are ultra-licentious in tone, classed among compositions professedly ethical; but it is not difficult to discover the reason.

The recurring burden of Maximianus' song is the unhappiness of old age; it is heard in the very first line:

Aemula quid cessas finem properare senectus?

interrupts the amatory narrative at intervals throughout, and closes the series of love experiences with the same melancholy note,

Claude precor miseras, aetas uerbosa, querellas.

We need not doubt that this was accepted as the prevailing subject of the work; and that it was regarded as a lesson in prudential morality, addressed particularly to those whose personal advantages or brilliant accomplishments were too generally attractive not to make a settled or particular passion distasteful. At any rate, Maximianus is found in the same highly decorous company in another and better, though less elegant, MS of the Brit. Mus. This codex, for the knowledge of which I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. E. M. Thomson, is also of the 13th century; 21, 213 in the Additional MSS. It is written in a small hand, often very difficult to read; unlike the King's codex, it is (except in one or two passages) free from interpolation, hence its variants are of special significance, and I have thought it worthy collation throughout. It gives as heading *Incipiunt nuge Maximiani*, which proves that one of the titles of the work was *nugae*. And so it is called by at least one medieval writer, Alexander de Villa Dei, who, in his *Doctrinale Puerorum*, speaking of the intended substitution of his own manual for the earlier work of Maximianus, says

Iamque legent pueri pro nugis Maximiani
Quae ueteres sociis nolebant pandere caris,

and again,

Proderit ista tamen plus nugis Maximiani.

It would be interesting to investigate the antiquity of this title, which was sufficiently common with earlier and more classical

writers; but the MSS hitherto known of Maximianus do not reach to the 6th century, few even to the 10th, and we are left to general probabilities. These are in favor of a simple, rather than an elaborate, heading; but this might support equally well the title found in the Riccardian codex, *liber Maximiani*. A third claimant is started by Wernsdorf, *de Senectute*, or *de incommodis senectutis*, and a title of this kind would suit many of the descriptions or allusions to the work in writers of the 15th and 16th centuries, as well as the verses of Eberhard of Bethune, who, in his *Labyrinthus* (13th century), recounting the poets then read in schools, writes

Quae senium pulsan incommoda maxima scribit
Et se materiam Maximianus habet.

On the whole, I think it probable that *Nugae* may have been the name originally given by the author; for the Brit. Mus. MS in which it is so called combines Maximianus with a group of ethical writers, where such a title would be out of place, except as traditional and acknowledged. It must, too, have been well known before the variation *Maximianus nugax*, with which a Luneburg MS is said to conclude, could become possible.

In many MSS, after the last line,

Hac me defunctum uiuere parte puto

a distich is added commemorating the name of an early copyist of the work:

Talibus infectae (incestae) deponis uerba senectae
Scriptus ab erimaco, Maximiane, lupo,

with the variants *uranico*, *auricamo*, *auritamo*, *arrepto*. The name may have been Eurymacus Lupus; but this must remain problematical till confirmed by further research. It is, however, not unimportant as an indication of antiquity.

The division of the poems into six elegies of unequal length is not found in the MSS and dates from Gaurico. But as Gaurico followed the internal indications of the poems, it is natural enough that two of his elegies should correspond with the distribution of previous editors. Thus in the early Paris edition mentioned by Wernsdorf, of which a mutilated copy is extant in the Bodleian, three great sections are found, one beginning with *En dilecta mihi*, Eleg. II in Gaurico, a second with *Captus amore tuo*, Eleg. III 5 in Gaurico, a third with *Missus ad Eoas*, Eleg. V 1 in Gaurico. Turning to the MSS we find little to guide us certainly. It is true

that many of these have a larger initial capital where the breaks indicated by Gaurico occur; but the same large capitals are found in many other places of the poems, and seem to point rather to an early sectional distribution, perhaps to a considerable number of short elegies, than to Gaurico's arrangement. The only clear and indubitable fact supplied by the MSS I have seen is in Bodl. 38, where, after II 74 *Est graue quod doleat commemorare dius*, the scribe has added *Explicit lib. I. Incipit lib. secundus*. The general excellence of this MS leads me to give great weight to this statement; and were it not that the leaves immediately following have been torn away, a loss which covers no less than 152 verses, we should perhaps be able to reconstitute the original form of the work, at least so far as concerns the division into books. If, however, the first book contained 366 lines, it seems probable that the remaining 320 did not form more than one other book; and this, a division into two books, each perhaps containing several elegies, is the conclusion which I am inclined to adopt; though, considering the inequality of the ancient *libri*, as shown at length by Birt in his careful *Antike Buchwesen*, it is not impossible that a third book commenced with the journey to Constantinople, where Gaurico placed the beginning of his fifth elegy. We should then have the following proportions: Book I, 366 verses; B. II, 154 vv.; B. III, 154 + 12 or 166 vv. This view will perhaps commend itself to those who recall Propertius' *Sat mihi, sat magnum est si tres sint pompa libelli*; and the triple division of Ovid's *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*. If I, myself, lean to the other view, it is because the Bodl. MS gives no intimation of a new book beginning with *Missus ad Eoas*, though, owing to the loss of leaves above mentioned, we cannot tell whether any such intimation once existed in it at *Hoc etiam meminisse licet* six lines earlier, with which verse the book narrating the journey to the East might equally well have begun.

Enough has been said to prove the wide popularity of Maximianus in the middle ages. It is no less clear from his various imitators and numerous excerptors. Bährens has published (P. L. M. V, p. 313) a fragment of forty hexameters on old age, probably written in the 8th or 9th century, which is little more than a cento from Maximianus. Venantius Fortunatus, a Christian poet of the 6th century, has many lines which look like reminiscences of him. Still more frequent are the collections of excerpts; some of these in the Vatican and Bodleian Libraries as well as at Paris I have looked at; others have been described by Schenkl; they are usually called *Maximianus* or *Prouerbia Maximiani*.

To estimate the grounds of this popularity, it will be worth while to examine the diction and metre of the poems with some particularity. The following specimens will give a fair sample of both:

I 51-74 Intrepidus quaecumque forent aduersa ferebam :
 Cedebant animo tristia cuncta meo.
 Pauperiem modico contentus semper amaui
 Et rerum dominus nil cupiendo fui.
 Tu me sola tibi subdis, miseranda senectus,
 Cui cedit quicquid uincere cuncta potest:
 In te corruimus, tua sunt quaecumque fatiscunt,
 Vltima teque tuo conficis ipsa malo.
 Ergo his ornatum meritis prouincia tota
 Optabat natis me sociare suis ;
 Sed mihi dulce magis resolutio uiuere collo
 Nullaque coniugii uincula grata pati :
 Ibam per mediam uenali corpore Romam
 Spectandus cunctis undique uirginibus.
 Quaeque peti poterat, fuerat uel forte petita,
 Erubuit uultus uisa puella meos
 Et modo subridens latebras fugitiua petebat,
 Non tamen effugiis tota latere uolens,
 Sed magis ex aliqua cupiebat parte uideri,
 Laetior hoc potius quod male tecta fuit.
 Sic cunctis formosus ego gratusque uidebar
 Omnibus, et sponsus sic generalis eram ;
 Sed tantum sponsus ; nam me natura pudicum
 Fecerat, et casto pectore durus eram.

III 43-84 His egomet stimulis angebar semper et ardens
 Languebam, nec spes ulla salutis erat.
 Prodere non ausus carpebar uulnere muto ;
 Sed stupor et macies uocis habebat opus.
 Hic mihi, magnarum scrutator maxime rerum,
 Solus, Boethi, fers miseratus opem.
 Nam cum me curis intentum saepe uideres
 Nec posses causas noscere tristitiae,
 Tandem perspicies tacita me peste teneri
 Mitibus alloquiis pandere clausa iubes :
 • Dicito, quando nouo correptus carperis aestu !
 Dicito et en dicti sume doloris opem.
 Non intellecti nulla est curatio morbi,
 Vt magis inclusis ignibus antra fremunt.
 Dum pudor est tam foeda loqui uitiumque fateri,
 Agnouit taciti conscia signa mali.
 Mox ait : ' occultae satis est res prodita causae.
 Pone metum : ueniam uis tibi tanta dabit.'
 Prostratus pedibus uerecunda silentia rupi,
 Cum lacrimis referens ordine cuncta suo.

'Fare' ait 'ut placitae potiaris munere formae.'
 Respondi 'pietas talia uelle fugit.'
 Soluitur in risum exclamans 'pro mira uoluntas!
 Castus amor Veneris dicito quando fuit?
 Parcere dilectae iuuenis desiste puellae:
 Impius huic fueris, si pius esse uelis.
 Vnguibus et morsu teneri pascuntur amores,
 Vulnere non refugit res magis apta plagae.'
 Interea donis permulcet corda parentum
 Et pretio faciles in mea uota trahit.
 Auri caecus amor natiuum uincit amorem:
 Coeperunt natae crimen amare suae.
 Dant utiis furtisque locum, dant iungere dextras
 Et totum ludo concelebrare diem.
 Permissum fit uile nefas, fit languidus ardor:
 Vicerunt morbum tabida corda suum.
 Illa nihil quaesita uidens procedere, causam
 Odit et illaeso corpore tristis abit.
 Proieci uanas sanato pectore curas
 Et subito didici quam miser ante fui.
 'Salue sancta' inquam 'semperque intacta maneto,
 Virginitas, per me plena pudoris eris.'

In the first of these passages no single word, if I mistake not, occurs which would jar on a fastidious ear as barbarous or unclassical. The only exceptions are *prouincia* and *sponsus generalis*, the former used seemingly of the district of Italy in which the poet lived, the latter in the sense of 'universal suitor.' *Generalis* in this meaning is found in Cicero, but only became common in the decline of the Empire. In the second extract, *turpesque reuoluere uestes* for 'to strip open a disordered dress,' is unusual; *passio*, for 'suffering,' is found in Apuleius, but otherwise is mainly affected by Christian writers; *occultae satis est res prodita causae*, whether for 'what you have revealed is hidden cause enough,' or for 'what you tell me is enough for explaining your secret complaint,' is slightly unlike the language of classical Latin: not enough, I think, to spoil the general impression of a successful imitation of good models; and incomparably better than any passage of equal length in Venantius Fortunatus, or even, I think, Ennodius. Such barbarisms as *pilente* abl. of *pilens* for *pilentum*, *resorbi* for *resorberi*, *cibamur* 'we are fed,' *peregrum* for *peregrinorum*, *lucem modernam*, for 'modern or to-day's light,' are unknown to Maximianus. On the other hand, he has some constructions which belong in the main to the language of late

Latin, *e. g.* the use of infin. to denote purpose, *Missus . . . pacis nectere opus*, V 1, 2, *nocere* with an accusative, I 156; and perhaps the double comparative *magis tristior*, I 170, of which other instances may be found in Venantius. But these, too, are quite exceptional and hardly spoil the collective impression of correct and spirited language.

Turning to the metrical peculiarities of the *Elegies*, we find much more to remark. Even since the publication of Lucian Müller's treatise *de re metrica*, the prosodial deviations from the classical standard which occur increasingly in the poetry of Christianity and the Decline have attracted little attention. But I am much mistaken if the verses of Maximianus do not hold a position of very exceptional correctness amid the general decay which reigns in the Latin poetry of that time. We can judge what this became in the 6th century, a little later than Maximianus, by examining the compositions of Fortunatus. Such false quantities as *mōrosa*, *postea*, *sīs*, *tenēretur*, *confitēreris*, *crederēs*, *senatūs* (genitive), *ālacer*, *stātū*, *inhabilem*, are there of frequent occurrence. Proper names are treated with a curious indifference to their real quantity, *e. g.* *Ioannēs*, *Igīdi*. Assonances which our schoolboys would carefully avoid are purposely affected and nauseatingly repeated, *e. g.* *fudit Montibus ille diem*, *mentibus ille fidem*, spoken of a Christian bishop, or

Dilexit coluit rexit honesta dedit,

or

Non premit urna rogi, sed tenet ulna dei,

or

Soluit et exequias obsequialis amor,

or

Antea carne carens quam caro fine ruens.

The *ophites* or *serpentine* verse in which the hexameter begins with the same words, generally three, with which the pentameter ends, a trick found in several epigrams of the Latin Anthology, and one of the most tiresome metrical experiments which ever taxed the ingenuity of pedants or poetasters, *e. g.*

Frater amore dei, digno memorabilis actu,
Pectore fixe meo, frater amore dei,

already begins to figure with something of the prominence which it afterwards assumes in medieval literature. These faults are not,

indeed, absent from Maximianus, but they are comparatively rare. In a total of 686 verses I have found only the following *ascertained* false quantities: *mortis his*, *senectūs*, *pēdagogus adit*, *uerēcundia* twice, *uerēcunda* once, *feūtura*, and the proper names *Bōeti*, *Ulixēs*. The following are doubtful: *Socrātem* (*Socraticam*, Auct. 5, 6), *condicio* (perhaps a mistake for *Contritio*), *caeruleūs* (*caeruleis*, Eton MS), *Sirēniis* (*Sirenum*, Bodl. 38). *O* of the nominative is often short: *passiō*, *curatiō*, *uirgō*, *imagō*, *Cupidō*; *o* of the imperative in *dicitō*; of the adverb, *quandō*; sometimes of the gerund, *cupiendō*. In one instance *-am* of the subj. is unelided before the initial vowel of the second half of a pentameter; but here again Bodl. 38 has what I believe Maximianus wrote, the second person, *Praestat ut abstineas, abstinuisse nocet*. It is the function of criticism to distinguish the amount of licence which a writer, generally following precise rules, is likely to have allowed himself; in the case of Maximianus I find it very difficult to believe that he could have written *Socrātem*, almost impossible that he should have written *condicio uitae*; on the other hand, there is nothing extravagant in the shortened *e* of *Sirēniis*, or the lengthened *ā* of *superciliā* before a double consonant in *frons*. In his sparing use of four and five-syllable words at the end of the pentameter, Maximianus follows the example of Propertius. I have counted fourteen quadrisyllables in 343 pentameters, *ingenium*, *uirginibus*, *arbitrio*, *destitimus*, *obicibus*, *auxilium*, *criminibus*, *uolneribus*, *tristitiae*, *obsequiis*, *officio*, *increpui*, *deliciis*, *exequiis*; one pentasyllable, *imaginibus*. They are always used to give rhythmical effect, or close a reflexion epigrammatically, as in I 171-4,

Non secus instantem cupiens fulcire ruinam
 Diuersis contra nititur obicibus,
 Donec longa dies, omni conpage soluta,
 Ipsum cum rebus subruat auxilium.

Elision is very rare in Maximianus, and generally confined to words in short *e*, *que*, *atque*, or syllables which precede *est*. The following are exceptional, II 65 *Quis suam in alterius*, III 66 *Soluitur in risum exclamans*, V 99 *Nempe iaces nullo ut quondam*. The only unusual caesura is in II 3,

Post multos quibus indiuisi uiximus annos,

a line which in the compass of three words repeats the same vowel,

i, no less than seven times, six times without interruption. The *ophites* occurs once, very felicitously,

Captus amore tuo demens Aquilina ferebar,
Pallidus et tristis, captus amore tuo.

a verse which has been imitated by Fortunatus, in whom I seem to trace not a few parallels to our author. But Fortunatus is as far below Maximianus in purity of language and versification as Maximianus is below the charming fragments of the fifth century, which Niebuhr ascribed to Merobaudes, in grace and freedom.

R. ELLIS.

II.—ON CERTAIN IRREGULAR VEDIC SUBJUNCTIVES OR IMPERATIVES.¹

In classical Sanskrit the non-thematic conjugations follow, almost without deviation, the old law for the distribution of strong and weak stems in accordance with the character of the endings attached to them. The singular active of the indicatives (present, imperfect, perfect, non-thematic aorists, etc.) is made from the strong stems; so also all forms of the subjunctive with the subjunctive sign *a* (the first persons of the imperative), and the third person singular of the imperative. All other forms in a non-thematic tense-system take weak stem-forms. There are only the rarest exceptions, notably in the root *çī*, *çete*, etc.; the imperative *ēdhi* for **ēzdhi* instead of **zdhi*; *brūmi* in the Rāmāyaṇa II 19, 4 for *bravīmi*; conversely *bravīhi* several times in the Mahābhārata for *brūhi*. The imperative *çādhi* has also an irregularly strong stem-form if the variation between *çāsmi* and *çismas* is original; the stem *çis-* does not occur in the Veda (Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar¹, §639); *babhūva*, throughout the language, cf. Zend *bavāva*, and Vedic *sasūva* by the side of *suṣāva*. Still more irregular is the stem *mārj-* in *mārjanti* and *mārjantu*, Whitney, §627.

¹A sketch of the theory advanced in this paper was presented to the American Oriental Society, at its meeting in Boston, May, 1883, and Professor Whitney added a criticism to the abstract published in the Proceedings of that meeting (p. xv fg.). He declared himself unable to accept my explanation of the subjunctives in question, and stated his reasons in full. He had no counter-theory to offer in the place of the one there proposed. In the present paper I have worked over the entire question anew, with a constant view to Whitney's remarks in the Proceedings, as also to additional ones communicated to me by letter. I have also given a careful sketch of all the forms which enter into the question, as far as they were accessible to me. It will be seen also that some objections fade away in the light of more careful statistics. So the adverse testimony of four forms, *yuyoma*, *yuyothās*, *rarāthām*, *mīmāthām*, against 214 forms restricted to the second dual and plural active, will be felt to weigh but very slightly. The paper as it stands is, however, not a polemical answer to Whitney, but an independent and more careful presentation of the facts, and of what seems to me the explanation of them.

In the various stages of the Vedic language the law holds equally good in general; only the number of exceptions is greater. So *hanīta* for *ghnīta* (TS, III 2, 9, 4); *yuyopimā* (RV, VII 89, 5); *viveçus* (RV, IV 23, 9); *jajanūs* by the side of *jajñūs* (both RV); *tātane* against *tātne* (both RV); *vavanmā* (for **vavnimā*) against *vavnē* (both RV); *sāsahānd-* against *sēhānd-* (both RV); *vāvaçus* (RV) where we should expect **ūçus*; *vāvasānd* against *ūṣivāns-* (both RV).

Next there are to be mentioned a number of imperative forms 2d sg. active with strong vowels. The accent is regularly on the suffix, in accordance with the general rule. In addition to *ēdhi* and *çādhi*, mentioned above, *çiçādhi* by the side of *çiçihī* (both RV); *yuyodhi* (RV); *gr̥hñāhi* (AV); *gr̥bhñihī* (AV and Āitareya-brāhmaṇa); *gr̥ñāhi* and *str̥ñāhi* (TS); *punāhi* and *çr̥ñāhi* (SV). And the scholiast to Pāṇini III 4, 88 reports *pr̥ñāhi* as Vedic; while Pāṇini himself (VI 4, 117) mentions *jahāhi* by the side of *jahihi* and *jahihi*.¹ Here also we may best mention the middle imperative second singular *rarāsva* (AV) by the side of *ririhī* (RV). Very common is the same irregularly strong stem in the aorist imperative: *bodhi* from roots *bhū* (RV) and *budh* (RV, AV); *mogdhi* (Whitney, §839); *yandhi* (RV); *māhi* (RV); *yódhi* (once RV) has irregular accent also. Here also are found two middle forms: *rās̄va*, with irregular accent (RV), and *mās̄va* (RV). Conversely there is to be mentioned an imperative third singular *bhūtu* (RV), but no strong stem *bho-* occurs anywhere in the root-aorist of this root.

Of an entirely different scope and importance, however, is the apparently irregular stem-vocalization in a large number of forms with subjunctive or imperative force. These appear at first sight to belong to that class which has been called at various times 'augmentless subjunctives,' 'imperfect subjunctives,' 'improper subjunctives,' or 'injunctives' (Brugman, Morph. Unters. III 2). They deviate from the regular methods of formation in that they present strong stem-forms accompanied by accent on the stem before endings which themselves regularly take the accent in non-thematic conjugations. The stems mostly end in vowels and semiconsonants and accordingly I classify them. Most prominent are the forms in *o*:²

¹ Cf. also Pāli *dadāhi*, which coincides (accidentally of course) with Greek *δίδοω*.

² I write the forms with accent, wherever there is even a single form which exhibits it; otherwise without accent.

tense: *yuyoma* (1 AV, VII 63, 8), 1st plur. act.; *yuyothās* (1 RV), sec. sg. middle; *rarāthām* (1 RV), 2d dual middle, and *mīmāthām* (2 RV), I believe, exhaust the list.

Further, the irregular distribution of strong and weak stems is, to a considerable extent, exhibited in the various preterite tenses; and here also, excepting only the root aorist, the occurrences of strong stems for weak ones is practically restricted to the second persons of the dual and plural active.

We begin our enumeration with the imperfects:¹ *ḍadadhāta* (1 RV); *ḍadadāta* (1 RV); *abravīta* (1 RV); *ḍbravītana* (3 RV); *akṛṇota* (1 RV); *akṛṇotana* (3 RV); *ḍjahātana* (1 RV); altogether 11 occurrences.² And outside of the second plural active there are only to be noted, in the active *apīpema* (1 RV) and in the middle *ḍmimātām* (1 AV). Of the occurrence of a weak stem for a strong one there is but one example: *minī*, augmentless imperfect 3d sg. from the root *mī* (1 AV); but even this is doubtful, see Whitney, Index Verborum to the AV, p. 382.

In connection with the imperfects may be best mentioned a few other augmented preterites with irregularly strong stems; pluperfects, *amamadus* (1 RV) by the side of *ḍmamandus* (RV), where the strong form is no doubt due to the model of the imperfect 3d plur. in *-us* of reduplicated presents (*ḍbibharus*, but *abibhran* in the RV); *ḍjaganta* (1 RV); *ḍjagantana* (1 RV); *ḍjabhartana* (1 RV).

The regular relation of strong and weak stems is preserved in a few cases of the reduplicated root aorist. (Vedic): *siṣvap*, 2d sg. active (RV); *suṣupthās*, 2d sg. middle (Pāraskara's Gṛhya-sūtra, II 3, 2); *ajīgar* and *adīdhar* (RV); *jigṛtā* and *didhṛtā* (RV); therefore *a-pi-pray-an* (TS), which is probably non-thematic (cf. *apīpres*), contains irregular guna. For completeness sake we may note in this connection the peculiarity, as yet unexplained, of reduplicated imperfects 3d person plural in *-us*: *ḍbibharus* (cf. *abibhran*, RV), etc., and *aṣīgrayus* (RV), *ḍcucyavus* (RV), *aṣuṣravus* (RV) and *asuṣavus* (? AB, cf. Whitney, §867). And *ḍcāsus* and *ḍāsati* (present 3d plur., cf. *ḍāsana*, pres. middle participle RV) apparently follow the same analogy.

¹ I omit *dyātana* from the enumeration, for the same reason as *jīgāta* and *yātāna* above.

² Five of these (3 *abravītana* and 2 *akṛṇotana*) occur in a single hymn to the ṛbhus in the first maṇḍala (161); two more (*abravīta* and *akṛṇota*) in another hymn to the ṛbhus (IV 35); the rest occur scatteringly.

There are now left only the indicative forms of the simple root aorist, where, for the first time, there is to be found a considerable number of forms with irregularly strong stems outside of the second person dual and plural active. That the old distribution of strong and weak stems was originally in force here as well as in the root presents is not to be doubted; the relation is preserved intact in the RV in *ḍṛoṭ*, *ṣṛuṭdm*, *āvar(s)*, *avṛta*, *āgan(t)*, *gaṭdm*, etc. The following are the irregular forms: *dkarma* (7 RV, 2 AV); *dhema* (3 RV); *bhema* (2 RV); *homa* (1 RV); *chedma* (1 RV);¹ the remaining forms are for the most part second pers. of the dual and plural; *akarta* (3 RV); *spartam* (1 RV); *ahetana* (1 RV); *aganla* (Whitney, §833); *aṣṛavan*, 3d plur. act. (1 AV), is the only other form.²

In the search for an explanation of these irregular forms, he who likes can resort to the ever ready expedient of simple analogy and mutual assimilation of forms to one another, and it may be granted beforehand that no explanation is possible which does not, to some extent, admit this in this body of forms. In other languages the cases in which such assimilation of strong and weak forms has taken place are too numerous to mention. So, *e. g.*, the Greek perfect and the modern High-German perfect are instances; originally **δεῖδFοια* (from which Hom. *δεῖδοικα*), *δέδιμεν*, but also *δέδια*; originally *οἶδα*: *ἴδμεν*, but also *οἶδαμεν*; Gothic *gab, gēbum*; German *ich gab, wir gaben*. The tenacity with which Vedic and Sanskrit have in general preserved the distinction is best observed in the perfect where only the few irregular forms cited on p. 17 can be quoted from the entire body of the language, and this alone would make doubtful the explanation merely by assimilation, inasmuch as the perfect seems especially prone to this disturbance everywhere else. But the following list of peculiarities which attach themselves to the body of forms enumerated above shall lead us to look for a different cause for this deviation.

1. The disturbance in the overwhelming majority of cases takes place in such a way that weak stems are displaced by strong ones. This can hardly be accidental; the assemblage of words above contains only sporadic instances of weak forms for strong ones. This becomes especially significant if it is remembered that the

¹ For *aganma*, *aganmahi*, *amanmahi* see below, p. 30.

² In this connection we must remember the forms of the 2d person singular imperative which have been mentioned above, p. 17, under the head of imperatives.

weak stems preponderate in every kind of non-thematic conjugation.

2. The extraordinary frequency of the quasi-subjunctive forms like *juhóta*, *ṣṛṇóta* among these irregularly strong forms, and what is especially noteworthy, with accent on the final stem-vowel (*ṣṛṇó-ta*, *juhó-ta*); this is against all usage in the improper subjunctive, as well as quite unnecessary for metrical purposes, if such underlie the irregularity; cf. the perfect *yuyopimā* with irregular guna in the plural: *ácittī yát táva dhármā yuyōpīmā* (RV, VII 89, 5), where the irregular guna-vowel occurs in the most exactly long position in RV meters. But there is no shift of accent. In the same way all the irregular perfect forms above retain the accent on the flectional element.

3. The special frequency of forms in the second plural with the secondary ending *-ta* (*tana*), and in proportion to their general frequency, also of the second dual with the ending *tam*.¹ Whitney, Sk. Gram. §§556 and 818, notices that the ending of the second plural is especially prone to violate the law for non-thematic stems. Neither he nor any other grammarian, it is safe to say, would be willing to see in this an original quality of the ending *ta*; certainly such an assumption would receive no support from the kindred languages. Any explanation of these irregular forms which does not take account of these peculiarities will deserve no hearing, while, on the other hand, it will become difficult to believe that a theory which does dispose of all of them is essentially false.

As the starting-point of this entire disturbance I regard the subjunctive forms like *juhó-ta*, *ṣṛṇó-ta*, etc. Of these we found in the second dual and plural 214 forms in the RV and AV, and only the four instances *yuyóma*, *yuyothās*, *rarāthām*, *mīmāthām*, in all other cases. This number would be increased by drawing in the Sāma-Veda and the metrical parts of the Yajus-Saṁhitās. On the other hand they are excessively rare in the only Brāhmaṇa text to whose verbal forms we possess an index,² namely, the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa; *yuyothās* and *ṣṛṇótana*, each once, are the entire material, outside of the mantras quoted in the text. This may be taken as a fair representation of the frequency of their

¹ The third person dual in *tām* is not represented among these forms, but this is due to its scarcity in general, and not to any structural difference.

² Avery, Verb-Inflection in Sanskrit, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. X, p. 277 fg.

occurrence in the brāhmaṇas generally, and I feel safe in saying that they are even more rare in the sūtras (again disregarding the mantra-quotations), if they occur there at all. This leads to the natural supposition that these forms were originated in the *metrical* diction of the mantras. Delbrück, *Altindisches Verbum*, pp. 41-4, classes these forms as 'improper subjunctives,' or imperatives, without stating any opinion as to the origin of the striking irregularity of stem-vowel and accent. Whitney, *Sk. Gram.* §§618, 654, 690, 704, 723, collects the forms under the head of the imperative, but distinctly disclaims that he has expressed any opinion as to their origin by this juxtaposition (*Proc. Am. Or. Soc.* May, 1883, p. xvi, bottom). It may be safely said that no one has ever regarded them as anything else than either 'improper subjunctives' or imperatives, and the few sporadic forms like *yuyothās*, *mimāthām* seem at first sight to testify in favor of the explanation as 'improper subjunctives.' The following seems to me to be the origin of these forms. There are three regular methods of making subjunctives in the Veda.

1. The 'improper subjunctives' ('injunctives') without subjunctive sign and with secondary endings.

2. Subjunctives with the modal sign *a* and primary endings.

3. Subjunctives with the modal sign *a* and secondary endings.

If we look over the scheme of the Vedic active subjunctive endings in Whitney's *Grammar*, §§560, 562, we cannot fail to be struck by the fact that aside from the peculiar ending *ā(ni)* of the first person singular, the secondary endings are wanting only in the second (and third) dual and the second plural, *i. e.* just those cases in which we have these peculiar forms like *juhōta*, *etana*, *kārta*, *gānta*, *punāta*. Indeed, as far as the *ā*-forms are concerned, there is no reason why they should not be sheltered in just this place. Forms like *punāta* and *dādāta* have strong stem, subjunctive sign *a*, the accent upon the verb-stem, and secondary *ta*; they are formally quite independent from forms like *punitā* and *dattd*, and there is no good basis upon which they could have been created analogically from these.

Further, if we look over the subjunctive forms possible according to the three methods above from a stem like *ṣṛṇu*, we find the following types: *ṣṛṇutā*, *ṣṛṇdvatha* and **ṣṛṇdvata*. It is seen at once why an additional form is needed; none of these forms are fit for iambic cadence, as they consist entirely of short syllables. Nothing is more natural than that of all these the least useful

should be remodeled; **ṛṇḍvata* with its four short syllables is certainly a form hard to employ in Vedic metres. Even the forms with primary ending *thas* and *tha* which produce apparently the same effect of four short syllables, would perhaps be left undisturbed in preference to the forms in *tam* and *ta*, because *th*, occasionally at least, seems to make position, as in the following cases:

yāt *sandāvatha* pūruṣam, X 97 (923), 5.

mahās *karatho* vārivo yāthā no, VI 50 (491), 3.¹

and compare Kuhn in Kuhn and Schleicher's Beiträge, III 472. Accordingly, I regard forms like *ṛṇḍōta*, *juhōta*, etc., as contracted or apostrophized forms from **ṛṇḍvata*, *juhḍvata*, etc. So only the accent on the stems of these forms becomes intelligible, and we have thus in such a stem, not an analogical product, but a historical 'organic' form.²

¹The fourth syllable in the common Vedic metres is preponderatingly heavy. See Haskell, Proc. Am. Or. Soc., May, 1881, p. vi fg.

²I have looked through all the passages in the RV which contain these forms, and I add here a concise sketch of the manner in which they are employed. Of 66 forms in *o*, 35 occur in the final cadences where the scheme $\cup - \cup$ (\cup) is demanded most imperatively. Examples are:

ghṛtām tivrām *juhōtana*, II 32, 7.

viṣṇor mahāḥ samanyavo *yuyōtana*, V 87, 8.

divā nāktanī cārum asmād *yuyōtam*, VII 71, 1.

Fifteen forms occur at the beginning of pādas in such a way as to bring the long syllable into the second place. See Benfey, Quantitätsverschiedenheiten, I 11; Haskell, Proc. Am. Or. Soc., May, 1881, p. vi fg. Examples are:

juhōta prā ca tiṣṭhata, X 14, 14.

sunōtā madhumattamaḥ, IX 30, 6.

ā *soṭā* pāri ṣiñcata, IX 108, 7.

sunōtana pācata brāhmavābase, V 34, 1.

In seven cases the *o* occurs in the fourth syllable; cf. Benfey and Haskell, loc. cit. Examples are:

brāhmā *kṛṇōta* pānya it, VIII 32, 17.

sōmam *hinōta* mahatē dhānāya, IX 97, 4.

īndram it *stotā* vṛṣanaḥ sácā sūtē, VIII 1, 1.

In X 30, 7 the *o* of *hinōtana* occurs in the eighth syllable of a jagati-pāda; in one case the *o* occurs in the sixth syllable of an uṣṇiḥ-pāda; see Haskell, p. viii, top:

āḍityāso *yuyōtana*—no añhasaḥ, VIII 18, 10.

In three cases the long syllable occurs in dvipāda virāj pādas, always in regularly long positions; see Haskell, p. 9, top:

ādyum *kṛṇōta*—cāmsaḥ ninitsoḥ, VII 34, 12.

sānemy asmād—*yuyōta* didyūḥ, VII 56, 9.

tmānā samātsu—*hinōta* yajñam, VII 34, 5.

In four cases the *o* occurs in the third place of distinctly trochaic pādas: III 9, 8a; V 28, 6a; VIII 1, 19b; VIII 16, 1b; there are only two other cases which are anomalous: VIII 1, 17a and II 30, 7b. If we compare with this the employment of real imperative forms like *kṛṇutā*, *ṣṛṇuta*, etc. (V 48, 5; VII 15, 1; VIII 80, 10; X 14, 13; X 30, 8; X 67, 11), it will be found that the odd syllables of iambic pādas (especially the fifth and seventh) are the place where the *u* of the stem falls.

The few *e*-forms tally perfectly with the regular employment of the *o*-forms, e.g. *pārā virāsa etana*, V 61, 4.

Of twenty-six forms in *ar*, those of more than two syllables are perfectly clear in their metrical application; twelve of them stand in the final cadences. Examples are:

āti viṣvāni duritā *pīpartana*, VIII 18, 17.

havyām indrāya *kartana*, I 142, 12.

In one case the *ar* falls into the second syllable of the pāda:

tyartā maruto dīvaḥ, VIII 7, 13.

Three pādas (II 14, 9a; VII 48, 4a; X 175, 2c) present the *ar* in odd places, but they exhibit more or less trochaic tendency; all of them begin with long syllables. The ten bisyllabic forms with *ar* are much less easily disposed of. Only four have the long syllable in even places (I 172, 3c; II 29, 1b; VIII 20, 26d; X 63, 7d). Three occur in odd places of pādas with apparently trochaic beginnings:

ó sú *varta* maruto vípram áchā, I 165, 4;

and similarly I 86, 9, 10. In three other cases *ar* appears in the first syllable, but the second one appears as long also, and the pādas are iambic:

kṛtā no ádhvann ā sugām gopa amā, VI 51, 15;

and similarly I 90, 5c; II 34, 6d.

If we compare with these the single occurrence of *kṛta*:

imám me agadám *kṛta*, X 97, 2d,

it is again clear that *kṛta* and *karta* are metrical doublets.

Of 32 cases in *an* (*am*) 14 are trisyllabic, and employed regularly in even positions, mostly final cadences, e.g.

asmábhyañ čárma bahulám ví *yantana*, V 55, 9.

Of 18 bisyllabic forms six have *an* in regular even positions; six times (I 135, 5; V 43, 10; 71, 1; VIII 8, 7, 17, 19) these bisyllabic forms occur in the third syllable of pādas, which are evidently trochaic before the caesura, e.g.

ā no *gantam* suarvidā, VIII 8, 7.

Six times again the *an* occurs in first syllables of pādas; here also trochaic tendencies are to be observed, but again the second syllable is also long:

gántā nūnám nó' vasā, I 39, 7;

similarly I 38, 2; 39, 9; V 87, 9; VIII 27, 5; 87, 4.

I have looked through, on the other hand, twenty occurrences of *gātām* and *gātā*, and again the employment of these is such as to stamp them as metrical correlatives to *gántām* and *gánta*, e.g.

indrāgnī tābhīr ā *gātam*, VI 61, 8.

The forms in mutes and in *ā* are also employed in such a manner as to bring the long syllable into even places, especially of the final cadence; only there is no direct metrical correlation between them and the corresponding forms with weak stems (*yundkta*, *yunṅktā*, *punāta*, *punitā*, etc.).

The metrical correlation of *ava* and *o* is established in many instances which cannot be impugned. The subject has been referred to quite frequently, and is treated especially by Kuhn in Kuhn and Schleicher's *Beitraege*, IV 192 fg., and Benfey, *Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Saṁhitā- und Padatexten*, II 18; cf. also Uvaṭa as cited by Regnier, *RV-Prātiçākhyā*, II 20.¹ Such a case is the metrical correlation of the stems *maghón-* and *maghdvan-*, e. g. in RV, VI 65 (506) 3, *maghón-* is to be read *maghdvan-*: *maghónīr* (*maghdvanīr*) *vīrávat pátyamānā*; there are several other such cases.

In the same way *gór* (gen. sg. stem *gó-*) is occasionally to be read **gávar*, as, e. g., RV, I 181, 8: *gór* (**gávar* = $\beta o(F)ós?$) *ná séke mánuṣo daçasyán*.

In RV, VI 3, 7 *óṣadhi* is to be read *dvaṣadhi*: *vīṣā ruksá óṣadhiṣu* (**dvaṣadhiṣu*) *nūnot*; cf. also the doubtful etymology proposed by the Petersburg Lexicon.

In RV, I 62, 7, *ródasī* is to be read as a word of four syllables, perhaps **rávdasī*: *ádharayad ródasī sudánsāh*.

An apparently clear case in which a written *ava* is to be read *o* is contained in *stavante*, RV, VI 26, 7: *tváyā yát stávantē* (*stónte*) *sadhavirā vīráh*.²

Further, there are cases of correlation which cannot be referred to metrical causes:

The origin of the vocatives *aghos*, *bhagos*, *bhos* from *aghavas*, *bhagavas*, *bhavas*; cf. Benfey, *Über die Entstehung des indogermanischen Vocativs*, p. 19.

For *çrona* (*çlona*), the common word for 'lame,' there appears in Vedic texts *çravaṇa* (*çlavaṇa*). So Kāty. Çr. Sūtra, XXIII 4, 16: *çravaṇa-kūṭa-kāṇaḥ cet* (scholia: *çrono vyādhi-viçeṣaḥ*; *çra-*

¹ Gildemeister, in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, V 273, collects a number of *çloka-pādas* from the *Mahābhārata* and *Manu* in which *ava* (and *avi*) must be read as single syllables. But inasmuch as even after contraction they fall into places where only a light syllable is demanded, the verses may perhaps be better regarded as hypercatalectic. An example is: *paribhoktā kṣmir bhavati*, *Manu*, II 201b. Possibly a practical pronunciation of *bhavati* (which is the word to be contracted in eleven of the passages) in two short syllables must be employed: *hodi* or the like.

² Perfectly parallel is the metrical correlation of *avi* with *ā*; here also the shortened form is produced by the apostrophe of *a*. So RV, VI 18, 12a, *sthāvira* is to be read *sthāūra* in a triṣṭubh hymn: *prā tuvidyumnāsya sthāvīrasya ghr̥ṣver*. On the other hand, in VI 19, 10d, *sthāūra* is to be read as *sthāvira*: *dhā rātnam māhi sthāurdm bṛhāntam*.

vaṇo rogaviṣeṣaḥ). Pancav. Br. XXI 14: yady andhaḥ syāt—yadi ḥlavaṇo, Ind. Stud. IV 426.

The Vājasaneyi-saṁhitā, IV 22 g., reads *tōto rāyaḥ*,¹ in which Mahīdhara glosses *tōto* either as an indeclinable noun, meaning 'spouse,' or as equal to *tvayi* (totalḥabdaḥ kalatravācī avyayam . . . totalḥ tvayi rāyaḥ santu). That the latter is the correct explanation appears from the readings of the Māitrāyaṇī and Kāthaka-saṁhitās: *tāva-tava rāyaḥ*, from which *tō* appear to be a contract form of *tāva*; *tō-to* is an āmreḍita-compound with the acute on the first member (Whitney, Sk. Gram. §1260):

nodhā (Bhāg. Pur. III 23, 47) = *navadhā* 'ninefold'; cf. *tredhā* = *trayadhā*, below.

Pāṇini, VI 3, 107-8, and Vopadeva, VI 96, mention *kava-* as derogatory prefix, and the former states that *kavapatha* is a Vedic word. The Kāṇikā-commentary compares it with *kupatha*, 'evil way' (in the ethical sense). *Kava* is probably correlative with *ko*, which also has disparaging value, as in *kodrava*, 'an inferior kind of grain.'

By the side of *lavaṇa*, 'salt,'² and *lavaṇa-trṇa*, 'a kind of grass' (Ḥabdakalpadruma), we have *loṇāra*, 'a kind of salt,' and *loṇa-trṇa* = *lavaṇa-trṇa* in the same thesaurus.

In Pāli and in Prākṛit *ava* and *aya* regularly change to *o* and *e*; E. Kuhn, Pāli-Grammatik, p. 55;³ Minayeff, Grammaire Palie, §19; Hemacandra, II 172. This contraction occurs as early as the Aṣoka-inscriptions, e. g. *yona* = *yavana*, 'Greek,' see Weber, Indische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aussprache des Griechischen, Berl. Academy, 1871, p. 616.

¹ The Tāittirīya-saṁhitā, I 2, 5, 2, has the corrupt variant *tōte*.

² I note also the following doubtful cases:

Vopadeva reports *gavāgra* = *goagra*, *gocī* (as a fem. to *gavāñc*), which may be = *gavācī*, 'a certain fish'; in both of these *gava* may merely be the stem *gava*, extended from *go* by suffix *a*.

In Hemacandra's Abhidhānacintāmaṇi occurs *yonala* = *yavanāla*, 'andropogon bicolor.'

I mention, without advocating them, the very doubtful etymologies of the Petersburg lexicon: *ogaṇḍ*, 'outcast,' from **ava-gaṇḍ*; *opaṣḍ*, 'braid,' from **ava-paṣḍ* (root *paṣ*, 'to bind'); *oṣṭha*, 'upper lip,' from **avastha*; *oṣadhi*, 'plant,' from **avasa-dhi*, 'containing nourishment'; according to a verse in the Pañcatantra (I 425, ed. Kosegarten; cf. Bōthlingk, Indische Sprüche, II 3225), the last is derived from the root *uṣ*, 'to shine'; *proṣṭha*, 'bench,' from **pra-ava-stha*.

³ Under dialectic (Pāli) influence there has arisen: *upoṣadha* (*poṣadha*) = *upavasatha*, 'fast,' 'vow' (Pet. Lex. I 992; IV 885); also *poṣadheya*, 'to be fasted on,' Lat. Vist. ed. Calc. 15, 13; Weber, Bhag. I 410.

The correlation of *aya* and *e* can also be illustrated by a fair number of cases. A. Kuhn in his metrical discussions in Kuhn and Schleicher's Beiträge, IV 190-1, assembles a large number of cases where *e* is to be read as two syllables, but he never suggests the resolution into *aya*. One word in the RV, *çreṇi*, which is frequently to be read with resolution, is preserved to us in its trisyllabic form in the Kauçika-sūtra, VIII (6) 65, 4, but not as *çraini*, as Kuhn resolves it, but as *çrayaṇi*: vimçatyodanāsu çrayaṇiṣu (so four MSS, the Chambers MS, çrapaṇiṣu; the Elphinstone MS, çreṇiṣu) çatam avadānāni vaddhri- (5 MSS, vadhri°; 1 MS, vaddhri°) samnaddhāni prthagodaneṣu' paryādadhāti.

In the same manner *tredhā*, when it has the value of three syllables, is, of course, not to be read *traīdhā* with Kuhn, but *trayadhā*; e. g. vidmā te agne tredhā (read *trayadhā* and note the alliteration) *trayāṇi* (RV, X 45, 2); the same is true of *dvedhā*, which is most probably for **dvayadhā*, there being no gunated form *dve* found elsewhere; cf. *nodhā* for *navadhā* above. *Dvesata* in Lāṭyāyanas Çrāuta-sūtras (according to the Indian editor also in Drāhyāyanas-sūtras) is translated by the commentator Agnisvāmin by: 'of equal measure from the navel up and down.' He also mentions and prefers the reading *dvayasata* (*dvayasa* + *ta*); *dvesata* is, moreover, clearly a contraction, because its *s* is unaltered; cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. X 145, note 3.

Kṣeṇa,¹ 'fit to dwell in,' Māitrāyaṇi-saṁhitā, II 9, 8; VS, XVI 43 and TS, IV 5, 9, 1, in parallel passages, read *kṣayaṇa*; see Böthlingk's lexicon, sub *kṣeṇa*.²

For the correlation of *ara* with *ar*, and *ana* with *an*, I have but little to offer; RV, I 127, 4, the word *arāṇi* is to be read as **arṇi*: tējiṣṭhābhir arāṇibhir dāṣṭy avase (read *arṇibhir* and *auāse*, Kuhn and Schleicher's Beiträge, III 469); RV, X 95 (921), 8cd, the stem *trāsa* interchanges with *tardsa*:

āpa sma māṭ tardsanti nā bhujoyās
ta atrasan rathasptṛço na 'çvāḥ.

Here, also, deserve to be mentioned the cases in which *ar* or *ra* are to be read as two syllables, as in *darçatā*, *vārṣiṣṭha*, *rudrā*,

¹ Professor Whitney directed my attention to this example.

² There may also be some correlation between *neṇāla*, 'Nepal,' and *nayapāla*, 'name of a man in an inscription,' Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays, II 280; see Petersburg Lexicon.

indra, etc., *loc. cit.*,¹ III 458 and IV 195, and in the place cited last there are to be found cases in which written *na* and *ma* are to read as *ana* and *ama*. On the other hand, I am not acquainted with cases in which etymological *ana* or *ama* is contracted into *an* and *am*.

The forms in *ā*, *o* and *e* alone form the sure phonetic basis of the transformation of these thematic subjunctives into forms which appear to be 'improper subjunctives.' It may be fairly doubted whether the *ar*-, *an*- and *am*-stems, and especially those ending in mutes (*anak-tana*, etc.), are themselves also contracted from *ara*, etc., or whether they are the result of an extension of the analogy of the forms in *ā*, *o* and *e*. In either case, the historical starting-point for the large mass of the irregularly strong stems which have been collected at the beginning of this paper, is secured.

It has been stated above that by this explanation there is obtained a full paradigm of the subjunctive active with secondary endings. Neither this fact, nor the desirableness of such a fact, seems to me to be impaired in the least by pointing out that there are other subjunctive persons which might also claim double forms (with primary as well as secondary endings), and yet are not capable of exhibiting them. As long as the possibility of primary and secondary endings (*dyati*, *dyat*) is established, every contribution which goes to strengthen the assumption, probable *a priori*, that subjunctives could once be made with either set of endings, ought to be welcomed. But, further, it can not as yet be claimed with certainty that the limitations of the *primary* endings in the active as laid down by Whitney, §562, are not too narrow. So Neisser, in Bezzenberger's Beiträge, VI 216, 219, 225, has assumed the existence of thematic subjunctives, third plural active, with primary endings: *kar-a-nti*, *gām-a-nti*, *vāc-a-nti*, which still wait for the criticism of the syntacticians. And possibly the future function of the present (Whitney, §777*a*), which occurs with especial frequency in the first persons, may yet be found to cover up subjunctives with primary ending.² So that, as far as the active is concerned, it may be possible, at some future time, to show that subjunctives could be made throughout with primary as well as secondary

¹ *Ravinda*, mentioned by the Çapdakaḥpadrūma as equal to *aravinda*, 'lotus-blossom,' is anomalous. Cf. also as instances of elision of *i* and *u*: *parṣad* = *pariṣad* and *śrabhiṣṭha* superlative of *śrabhi*.

² In all the thematic present systems, indicative and subjunctive forms would coincide formally in the first persons of the dual and plural; *gachāmas*, as far as its form is concerned, can be a subjunctive with primary ending.

forms, always excepting the first person singular $\bar{a}(ni)$, which is *sui generis*, and seems to have crowded out both primary and secondary endings (*mi* and *m*), if these were ever employed in the subjunctive at all.

If this starting-point be granted for the production of the irregular forms collected at the beginning of this paper, it seems to me not difficult to show how the irregularity extended from these into other formations. First of all, we find them in augmented forms (e. g. *akṛṇota*, *akṛta*). The road by which they can have made their way into these is not difficult to find. I have shown above (p. 24) that, practically, couplets like *kṛṇota-kṛṇutā* and *kṛta-kṛtā* complement one another in such a way that one is employed in positions where the other is not admitted and *vice versa*. They are used and functionally felt to belong together just as metrical doublets like *didihī-dīdihī* (both RV), *vīhī-vīhī*, *sū-sū* and numerous others. Now, in the mantra-language a form like *kṛṇutā* or *kṛtā* can be either an augmentless imperfect or an 'improper subjunctive,' so that these forms stand in close connection, formal and functional, with the augment preterites (*akṛṇuta* and *akṛta*) on one side, and with their metrical complements *kṛṇota* and *kṛta* on the other. This furnishes the starting-point from which augment preterits with strong stems arose, according the proposition

$$\begin{aligned} kṛṇutā : akṛṇuta &= kṛṇota : x \\ kṛtā : akṛta &= kṛta : x \end{aligned}$$

i. e. *akṛṇota* and *akṛta*.

With this assumption the great mass of the irregular forms assembled above is explained. To be sure the aorist seems to have gone beyond the precincts of the second dual and plural in the forms *akarma*, *ahema*, *bhema*, *homa*, *chedma*, recounted above, p. 20, and in the imperative forms *bodhī* (from roots *bhū* and *budh*), *mogdhi*, *yandhi*, *māhi*, *yódhi*, p. 17.

In the imperative the present also offers the same species of irregularly strong forms (above, p. 17), and it would seem as though all of these were made under the influence of the third person singular of the same mode, i. e. *gṛhṇāhi* after *gṛhṇātu*, etc. Certainly the suggestion of De Saussure, *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles*, p. 190, to the effect that there may be something original in these strong stems of the imperative is an improbable one¹ and is in no way strengthened by the sparse material

¹ Inasmuch as the accent is on the flectional element (*d*)*hi* in all those forms excepting *yódhi*, *yuyodhī*, *ṣṛṇāhī*, *punāhī*.

from the Greek, with which these forms are compared. And the spread of the strong stems from the second dual and plural into the first plural of the aorist may have been advanced by the analogy of such forms as *aganma*, *amanmahi*; in these the stems *gam-* and *man-* are not strong but weak = *gm̐*, *mn̐* before vowels, cf. *hanmās* : *hānti* = *imās* : *yānti*. All other forms mentioned above are sporadic and are also the result of the tendency originally established by the historical forms like *kr̥ṇōta* which naturally enough spread beyond its legitimate bounds, furthered in this spread by the convenient way in which such strong stems lend themselves to the needs of iambic or trochaic metres, as shown in the statistical account above.

The three chief peculiarities which attach themselves to the body of forms with which this paper deals, are now easily carried back to their source. First, the prevalence among them of what appear to be 'improper subjunctives' is due to the fact that these forms alone were the original historical basis for the production of the strong stems, while they were carried into other categories only by a secondary process. Secondly, the prevalence of strong stems is due to the fact that the contraction of *ava*, *aya*, etc., to *o*, *e*, etc., always yielded strong stem-vowels. Thirdly, the extraordinary prevalence of strong stems before the flexional elements of the second (and third) dual and the second plural is due to the fact that the thematic subjunctive stems with these secondary endings, contracting, as they did, just in this connection, set a wide example for an almost prevailing use of stems with strong vowels before these endings.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

III.—RESEARCHES IN THE CYRENAICA.

WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF ITS HISTORY SINCE THE DECLINE OF THE EMPIRE.

[In the following general sketch no attempt is made to offer a detailed criticism, nor yet to discuss the history of the Cyrenaica in classical or ante-classical times, this latter topic being reserved for another occasion. For convenience, the following historical note is prefixed :

Cyrene, (*Kυρήνη*), the nucleus of all subsequent development in that region, was colonized (623-4 [?] B. C.) by Dorians from Thera, under the influence of the oracle of Delphi. It was under the rule of Battus and the Battiadae for a period of about two centuries, and, after another century of republican government, it came (322 B. C.) into the power of the Ptolemies. Bequeathed to Rome by Apion (96 B. C.), as Libya Pentapolis (from its five cities—Cyrene, its port Apollonia, Teuchira or Arsinoë, Ptolemais, and Hesperides or Berenice), it soon became a populous and important province (74 B. C.); was afterward (27 B. C.) joined with Crete, and so remained until the time of Constantine. Cf. Herodotus, IV 150-203; Grote, c. xxvii, and c. xcvi at p. 249, vol. XII.]

In coasting along the southern shore of the Mediterranean from the west, after passing Algeria and northern Tunis, one finds that the shore recedes abruptly three hundred miles to the south, thus marking the eastern limit of the great foreland of North Africa. Then comes the province of Tripoli, until, the shore gradually falling back still further to the south, one reaches the Great Syrtis and the Gulf of Sidra. From this point the coast-line returns two degrees to the north, then swings around in a broad arc, which at its highest point touches the latitude of Tripoli, and finally sweeps off a little south of east towards Egypt. We have reached the Cyrenaica.

Not far over the sea to the north are the shores of Greece, and nearer still lies Candia,—so near that in fair weather a ship does not lose sight of land in crossing to the African coast. Five hundred miles beyond is Alexandria, with Tripoli left as far behind. This lesser foreland, thus described, includes the great plateau of Barca; but Barca's "desert sands" lie many miles from the sea, kept back by hills and valleys, fields and meadows, and woods of vigorous growth. Near the most northern part of this

great bend, about ten miles distant from the sea, and overlooking it from a commanding point of defense two thousand feet above, lie the deserted ruins of Cyrene, once conspicuous from passing ships for its lofty splendor of marble. The ancient site, now called Shahat, or in a more restricted sense Grennah, after its ancient name, is in lat. $32^{\circ} 49' 38''$ N., long. $21^{\circ} 49' 5''$ E.

The Cyrenaica in a wider sense corresponded nearly to the modern Barca, a district which is about four hundred miles long, extending from the bottom of the Gulf of Sidra, long. 19° , to the Great Catabathmus, long. 25° , and which is about three hundred miles wide, extending from lat. 28° ¹ to lat. 33° . But we have only to deal with the Cyrenaica in a narrower sense, the part anciently inhabited by European colonists and immigrants, and containing the five principal cities which gave to the country its name Pentapolis. This is a mountainous deep-soiled tract of segmental form, lying between the sea and a line which might be drawn from a point say thirty miles south of Bengasi² to the Gulf of Bomba,³ over two hundred miles away. Within this district, which is about seventy-five miles wide,⁴ is an elliptical plateau two thousand feet high, and of an area about equal to twice the island of Crete. The deep undulations of its surface gradually diminish toward the south, until at last it appears as though the sea had once been there and left a beach. The deserts (Sahara) are beyond. A range of hills a thousand feet high skirts the shore at a distance of about three miles, and opposite that part of the brow of the plateau upon which Cyrene stands this range of hills forms a precipitous boundary to a table-land eight miles in width, from which the gradual ascent to the plateau above is broken by a long succession of deep ravines and rounded ridges trending toward the shore. It is at the head of one of these ravines, where a carriage-road wound its way, that the city spreads itself out like a triangle, of which the right angle points toward the south and is protected by a wall. Beyond and below, toward the west, is the oldest and richest part of the necropolis, which, however, is most extensive on the south and south-east.

It is a noteworthy fact that scarcely a single writer who has visited the Cyrenaica in ancient or modern times has failed to speak with enthusiasm of the remarkable fruitfulness and natural

¹ Or, perhaps, a hundred miles further into the desert.

² 140 miles W. by S. from Cyrene.

³ 90 miles E.S.E. from Cyrene.

⁴ 10,000 square miles is a moderate estimate for the total acreage.

beauty of this vast garden. It is probable that of all the countries bordering the Mediterranean, none has a more luxuriant vegetation. A fresh, cool climate, with heavy summer dews and winter showers, feeding scores of springs and mountain brooks, is brought by the prevailing wind from the N.N.W. (the Hellespontias of the ancients). The traveller still finds plenty of game, but there is no longer any danger from the savage beasts told of by Herodotus, and of course the former wealth of flocks and herds is not kept up by the present restless and lawless inhabitants.

In the country of which Cyrene was the head, Abulfeda enumerated a hundred ancient sites, and modern travellers have from time to time made probable or conjectural identifications of a considerable number of them. But of the majority we do not know how great they were, nor when they flourished, for their history has never been written; and though the soil of some of them has been stirred a little, none of them has ever been really investigated. The total population of the district must, in any case, have been very large. As it is now, the Greek, the Roman and the Jew have given place to the Bedouin Mahometan, the fixed population being confined to a very few points along the shore. At the middle of the last century the number of Arab tents was estimated at 50,000, and in 1868 Rohlf's estimated the population to be 300,000; but it is impossible to speak with any confidence on the subject. Let us now follow the shore, noting the chief places of interest.

Bengasi (anc. Berenice, Hesperides, Euesperides¹), on the western coast, one hundred and forty miles or more from Cyrene, is the chief town of the province, having a large population and a very extensive European commerce, Derna being the only other shipping port or inhabited town of consequence. There is steam communication with Malta, and coasting vessels from Tripoli touch occasionally both here and at Derna. The caravan trade, moreover, is enormous; indeed, the tribute to the Porte in 1850 (\$150,000) was twice that of Tripoli. But the tumble-down houses, as usually described, seem to be little more than rubble-stone shanties cemented with clay which the rain washes out. Beyond the gardens and the broad fertile plains which surround the town,

¹ The colonists who first settled here seem to have found a smiling wilderness of flowers, which they changed to a fruitful paradise, and in which, either rightly or wrongly, they deemed themselves to have discovered the Gardens of the West, so famed in ancient story.

except on the side of the sea, it is cut off from the mountains by fields of sand and shallow lakes of salt water, supplied in part by tidal overflows. A commodious and well-sheltered harbor has, within two or three centuries, become so clogged with sand that it is now open only to vessels that draw less than seven feet, though its present wretched condition might easily be greatly improved by dredging.

There are scarcely any fixed habitations between Bengasi on the west and Derna on the east, although certain families or tribes have been known to settle down permanently isolated in a tent life among the hills. The caravans pass to the south of Cyrene, the road over the plateau being better than the hilly one by the sea.

Forty-five miles beyond, passing the site of Adrianopolis, a place of some repute in later Roman times, we approach Tokrah (anc. Cleopatris, Arsinoë, Teuchira), where was once one of the oldest settlements. There appears never to have been a good harbor at this point.

Thirty miles further east is Tolmetta (anc. Ptolemais), which formerly, before it was ruined by the earthquakes, had the best harbor of the Cyrenaica, and served as the port of the ancient city of Barca. In early Christian times it was the chief town of the district and the residence of the Bishop, and covered an area of three or four miles in circuit. Here the great plateau almost intersects the shore, from which at Bengasi it retreats twenty or thirty miles.

The powerful city of Barca, the oldest colony of Cyrene, stood strongly fortified by nature on the heights a few miles inland. Many have thought, wrongly as it appears, that Barca is identical with the modern Merdjeh, fifteen or twenty miles from the sea, where is a modern fort and a Turkish garrison. But we need further information about the antiquity of this latter site. Barca was distinguished for having a large Libyan population, but it declined with the growth of its port Ptolemais.

A journey of seventy miles along the shore, broken by the ancient promontory of Phycus, brings one to Marsa Sousa (anc. Apollonia), the port of Cyrene, and later of the whole Pentapolis. Having shared the common fate, it is no longer of value as a harbor, and there is no sweet water in its wells.

A few miles beyond are the ruins of the ancient Naustathmus, where the shore line makes a sheltering bend.

Derna (anc. Darnis), fifty miles east of Cyrene, is the second town of Barca, and, in Barbary fashion, is made up of several distinct wards. In 1801 the French troops on their way to Egypt were refused a landing by the plucky inhabitants, and in 1805 the United States, being at war with Tripoli, forced the Pacha to terms by establishing his rival brother at Derna. The fort which they erected is still observable on one of the slopes behind the town. The harbor, which is exposed to the prevailing winds, is so unsafe that traffic with Candia is limited to the summer months.

Ninety miles E.S.E. of Cyrene is Bomba, not excelled by any roadstead on the north coast of Africa. (Tabruk, fifty miles beyond, is the only other anchorage of the first rank.) In this gulf is the island of Platea, whence the colonists passed to the mainland, and near by lay the districts of Irasa and Aziris, where once was a temple to Heracles.

Let the traveller now return toward the west along the verge of the plateau, and at distances of not many miles he will come upon the remains of many small towns, outposts, hamlets, and even suburbs of the metropolis. Such were Limnias (Lamloudeh), Archile [?] (Ghernes), Thintis (Tereth), Balacrai, Zaouani; and near Cyrene on the S.E., Sofussa (Safsaf), with its pilastered walls of squared masonry, its forts, its temples, a hypogeum, an enormous reservoir with an aqueduct twelve miles long for the supply of the larger city, and in the streets the ruts of chariot wheels.

The oases of Adjedebiah (anc. Augila), two hundred and fifty miles from Bengasi toward the south, and of Siwah (Ammon), three hundred and fifty miles further east, are by nature commercial centres for the desert, and were formerly brought into direct communication with Cyrene.

This brief geographical sketch seems to be required as an introduction to the subject in hand.

To trace out the first cause of national disintegration is about as difficult as to account for the first verging of the scale that leans to national prosperity. Though from its situation the Cyrenaica was always provincial, yet by the favors of nature and by the enterprise and genius of its inhabitants it became a little cosmos of well-rounded prosperity. It was among the earlier of the Roman provinces, and by the clientship of its last ruler had been more or less under Roman influence for several years previous, though never urged by force of arms. Too firm in its ancient

establishment to be blighted by the Empire, and not so fortunate as to be cut off in its glory like Carthage, the remaining fate was that under the Empire it should decay.

The first great loss of strength came at the close of Trajan's reign. Even before the time of Sulla the Jews had crossed the desert from Egypt, and had found the freedom of the Pentapolis so agreeable and the protection of Rome so serviceable that their numbers, and hence their ambition, increased with alarming rapidity. Lucullus was sent to quell an insurrection; and in the year 33 B. C. the body politic of Berenice was Jewish. In Vespasian's time, while one Catullus was prefect, about five thousand Jews had been butchered by the sicarii. But before Hadrian came to the throne, the rapacious and intolerant governors of the province set fire to the worst passions of the race, and at length, in the massacre of 220,000 (according to Dion, LXVIII 32) of the gentile population, their mad and implacable fury broke out and spent itself at last. Invasion, plagues and earthquakes following, showed that fortune had deserted the land in its weakness,¹ and the demands of the tottering Empire sapped every recuperatory source.

At the close of the fourth century Cyrene had suffered a gradual diminution of its former power as chief city of the Pentapolis, until as a province of the Eastern Empire under Arcadius it might be said no longer to exist. The words of Ammianus (book XXII), "*In Pentapoli Libya Cyrene posita est urbs antiqua, sed deserta,*" are fully supported by Synesius, the Bishop of Ptolemais. By his African life, and a character that had not suffered from the evils of his time, he was best qualified to become our authority for the period which he describes. His impassioned efforts to stay the progress of destruction failed to move the Emperor to give any adequate means of relief. It is true that a church quibble might have raised an army, but the Libyan hordes, easy to repulse, were free to extend their ravages in this ancient realm, until early in the fifth century the tribe of the Ausurii swept over the land. Then the altars and tombs afforded no refuge. Their fields burnt over, and their wealth of flocks and herds at the same time destroyed or driven away, the inhabitants, men, women and children, became alike slaves.² The barbaric world north and south seemed

¹ Hadrian is said to have sent out new colonists in the year 122. Hieronymus, ed. Schöne, pp. 164, 167; Orosius XVII 12, p. 487 Haverc.

² It may be noted that the slave trade, being well suited to the indolence of the native population of the coast, has been very extensive even up to the last decade.

to have met under some terrible inspiration at the Mediterranean Sea.

Cyrene in ruins, the rest of the Pentapolis, under the second Theodosius, was drained by the insatiable greed of its governors, the prefects of Egypt, and the resident military commanders (notably one Andronicus). The Vandal Genseric was master of Carthage, and the Cyrenaica would have fallen into his hands had it not been delivered by some Huns in the service of the Empire. There followed a period of comparative repose, until, about the year 616, the second Chosroës, at the height of his power, overran the Cyrenaica, and for a few years retained it as well as Egypt against the Empire. The Greek population was almost wiped out, and soon afterward suffered total extinction; for the faith of Islam had begun to spread itself over the outlying provinces of the Empire.

When, in 640 A. D., the Saracens, moving westward for conquest, had, as it were, accepted the gift of Egypt without the opposition of the few Roman inhabitants, the people of the Cyrenaica saved themselves for the time from the Mussulmans' yoke by a treaty with their chief, but in six years they were forced to yield to the dynasty of the Ommiades, who for the time being chose Barca for the seat of their power.¹ Under the Ommiades and their successors the Abassides,² though the Cyrenaica had to bear the brunt of intestinal revolt within the Caliphate, and was seized by El Abbas in 879 against his father the Sultan; yet the Christians retained their own bishops for three hundred years. With the Caliphate of the Fatimites in Egypt came the final ruin of the Pentapolis. Even Barca became a mere borough. The Christians left the country, and a sparse population along the southern border of the Syrtis kept up the feeble flame of civilization.

Henceforth a merely nominal province, the Cyrenaica passed from the Fatimites in 1171, first under Saladin and his successors, then from the middle of the XIIIth century under the Mamelukes, to the beginning of the XVIth, when, with Egypt, it was finally absorbed into the Ottoman Empire by the conquest of Selim I. In 1550 Soliman the Magnificent, or rather his general Sinan-

¹ Hence the modern Arab name of the whole region, "Berke."

² The error of those who, like the translator of the *Annales* of Abulfeda, thought that the Moslem governors of Africa lived and were buried at Cyrene, will be discussed further on.

pacha, wrested Tripoli from the hands of the Maltese knights, bringing the Cyrenaica under the same imperial pacha—an officer whose rather despotic power has been supported by a standing army, quartered in various towns and outlying districts of his regency. He has been uniformly appointed by the Porte, generally with a four years' tenure of office, since the year 1835, when the turbulence of an hereditary pachalik, which had maintained itself—subject to the approval of the Grand Vizier—for 120 years, and with control of the Cyrenaica, was, with the assistance of Gt. Britain, summarily brought to an end. Not a tributary province like Egypt under stipulated relations with the Porte, Tripoli, including Barca, has been an integral part of the Ottoman Empire.

During the same period, Barca, as a sandjak of Tripoli, with a governor often, in late years, appointed directly by the Porte, according to the whim of the Grand Vizier, has been subjected to the extortions of the same sovereignty; and scarcely a decade has passed since famine and cattle-plague were added to the misfortunes of this province. The local government was formerly maintained by Beys, one at Bengasi, the present capital, ruling a very large district; one at Derna, having within his district the ruins of Cyrene and a territory about three hundred miles in extent from east to west; and one at Augila in the desert. Recently, however (in 1879), Barca was created a Vilayet or province of the first order, whose Vali of necessity looks to the Sublime Porte for his appointment. After all, its inaccessible position and unstable population render it a most wayward and slippery possession of the Empire.

It was near the middle of the last century that Europe actually discovered anew¹ this long-neglected tract, that even now is hardly distinguished from the desert of Barca. The inaccessibility of the country, and its Bedouin inhabitants, have naturally proved a hindrance to antiquarian research in fields already rendered less tempting to the explorer by being deeply buried under the washings of a light soil.

The fashion of dividing Asia and Africa at the Nile, or at the Great Catabathmus farther west, had even then scarcely passed away, and the elaborate descriptions of Africa, current for two centuries back, had, very properly, apportioned the northern coast into Barbary, Mesurata, Cyrenaica or Barca, and Marmarica.

¹ Except that in 1216 the Genoese obtained of the Emir of Africa the rights of traffic all along the coasts of Barca and Tripoli.

But the accounts of the Cyrenaica were made up by combining the tradition of ancient geographers with the reports of more modern travellers who had been no nearer than Tripoli and the Sahara. The result was the curious and widespread error, old as the middle of the XVIth century, of mistaking the name of the flourishing and important town of Käyrawân,¹ in Tunis, for that of Grenneh,² the ancient Cyrene.

This Käyrawân (about eighty miles south of Tunis) was the first seat of Saracenic empire in Barbary, and for two centuries after 670-5, when it was founded as a place of refuge from the barbarians, it was the capital of the Arab dominions in Africa,—of nearly the whole northern part of which it is now the religious capital, with ten or fifteen instead of, as formerly, sixty thousand inhabitants. And yet the great historian de Thou says it was founded in the Cyrenaica, and Marmol was led to confound the Cyrenaica with the Mesurata; but the most amusing confusion of all is to be found in Moreri's Dictionary, where, by placing Barca in Barbary, and Käyrawân in the Pentapolis, the author contrives to refer all his information about both places to one and the same spot. Even Reiske, in the translation of Abulfeda, continually speaks of Cyrene, a city of which really no mention is made (cf. sub an. I), and the French orientalist Herbelot and M. Otter were, among others, similarly deceived. It was not until 1846 that the last vestiges of this egregious blunder disappeared, to make room for the Cyrenaica among the regions of the known world.

It is true that as early as the beginning of the last century (1703 and 1706), M. Lemaire, French consul at Tripoli, had published an account³ of the situation and ruins of Cyrene and some other sites. But it was very superficial, though there was nothing to take its place; and as it did not become widely known for many years, the error explained above was not dispelled. The writer tells of the extensive remains of a splendid town twelve miles in circuit; of a pure and abundant spring forever purling from the

¹ "Caravan station" (?) Of the various modes of spelling which I have found, —Kairouan, Kairwan, Kairvan, Cairwan, Karuan, Kiruan, Cairoan, Cairouan, Carvan, Caruan, Carven, Kerouan, Kirwan, Cairavan, Cahiroan,—no one approaches very near to "Cyrene."

² Qrennah, Guerennah, Grenne, Gren, Corene, Curen.

³ "Mémoire d'un voyage dans les montagnes de Derne," in the "Voyages de Paul Lucas." Ed. 1712, t. II, p. 85-123. Lucas visited the country in 1710 and in 1723.

living rock, with the word *Κυράναι* above it, of heavy temple-walls, huge columns of marble and granite, of carved mausolea, of reservoirs filled with water, some with the builders' marks upon the stones; of what he thought to be shops and dwellings hewn in the rock, and, finally, of reliefs and mutilated statues; all in a fertile land poorly tilled by Arabs who were little better than the nomads of the desert.

The learned account of Dr. Thomas Shaw¹ who passed through the Cyrenaica in 1738 has been widely used as an authority on the manners and customs of the natives, and various physical conditions of the country, to the end of confirming the accounts of ancient writers by reference to the existing state of things.

About 1760, M. Granger, a French surgeon, who had travelled in Egypt, visited Cyrene from Derna under guidance of a robber chief. He remarked the magnificent ruins and running fountain, described rare plants, and copied Latin and Arabian inscriptions; but the interesting and detailed account which he wrote was unfortunately lost² some time after his return to Paris.

The famous Abyssinian traveller James Bruce,³ at the beginning of his long exploring expedition (1768-72), found Bengasi and Derna suffering from famine, plague, and civil war. He spent a short time at Ptolemais, where he obtained some relics for the King's collection.

In 1812 an expedition from Tripoli, to quell a revolt of the governor of Derna, gave an opportunity to S. Augustin Cervelli, an Italian physician, to visit the principal sites and indicate their internal topography as determined by the vestiges above ground. He also made a few very crude drawings, and wished to prolong his stay at Cyrene. But he was scared away by the Arabs.⁴

It was not until after 1817, when the physician Paolo Della Cella accompanied a second expedition from Tripoli, under the son of the Pacha, against the Arabs of Barca, under the lead of an older brother, that the curiosity of the French and English was first fairly aroused. Della Cella was a person of high training, and his interesting letters⁵ were full of ingenious observations and suggestive revelations; but the information they conveyed was vague and therefore unsatisfactory.

¹ Travels.

² Belley, *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inss.* 37, p. 389.

³ Travels, I xxxviii ff.

⁴ Relations inédites de la Cyrénaïque. Soc. Geog. Rec. des Voy. II 20-28.

⁵ Viag. da Trip. di Barber. alle front. occi. del Egit. . . e scritto in Lettere . . . Genova, 1819. Translated into French, German, and English.

Père Pacifique de Monte Cassiano, a Romanist missionary at Tripoli, wrote a short account of a journey made two years later, in 1819, through the cities of the Pentapolis. He copied a great many inscriptions, and added a little to what was already known of the ruins above ground. The remains of antiquity to be found at Cyrene made it seem to him comparable to a second Rome. He believed that from the Champ-de-Mars one might count more than twenty thousand tombs. He could scarcely express his admiration. But he, like all who had preceded him, went without proper equipment or the necessary resources.¹

The next year, however, a Prussian general, Minutoli, organized an able party of scholars and draughtsmen, and on his way from Alexandria in the face of all obstacles interposed by the Arabs, had reached the Great Catabathmus, marking the western limit of the Egyptian coast, when the death of several of his party who had attempted to acclimate themselves too quickly amidst the hardships of the desert, compelled him to abandon the journey. Others, however, were led to renew the enterprise.

The first expedition of any note was undertaken in the years 1821-22, by Capt. W. F. Beechey, R. N., and his brother, H. W. Beechey. In the space of six hundred pages there is an elaborate account of their journey from Tripoli through the Pentapolis, with careful plans of the ancient sites, tables of lat. and long. furnished by the surveying vessel which accompanied them for the purpose of laying down the coast-line, a map of the coast, some reproductions of paintings, and drawings of objects of architectural interest.²

In 1827, the year before this volume appeared, there was published in Paris a work, rather more widely known, entitled "*Voyage dans la Marmarique et la Cyrénaïque*," by a young French artist, Jean Raymond Pacho. A quarto volume of four hundred pages of text was accompanied by a still larger volume of colored plates, drawings, and inscriptions, the whole being an account of a journey from Alexandria in 1824-25, and a most sumptuous array of illustrations of the principal monuments.

These two exploring parties worked entirely independently of each other, and it was not till Pacho returned to France that he learned of the labors of the Beecheys. The two accounts, neither of which can be neglected, mutually correct and supplement each

¹ Rec. de Voy. et de Mém. 2, p. 28.

² Proceedings of the Expedition to explore the North Coast of Africa. London, 1828.

other, and together constitute almost all that is known of the modern Cyrenaica. They are both full of details on nearly every subject related to the matter in hand, and yet both are superficial in that they deal only with what was readily accessible above ground, and within the necessary limits of time and money; and in that the explorers themselves were better able, as highly educated draughtsmen and trustworthy observers, to narrate and to copy, than, as experienced archaeologists, to make intimate comparative analyses and to judge of and explain their results. It is not therefore surprising, though it is certainly unfortunate, that these works, valuable as they are, do not, like the plans of Assos, make it a matter of comparative indifference whether the monuments which they portray do or do not remain longer in existence.

The Museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland was enriched in 1830 by a collection of works of art, made a short time before in the Cyrenaica by Mr. H. G. Warrington, son of the British Consul at Tripoli. Among other things in his collection there are, according to Mr. Weir,¹ a fine statue of Aesculapius; several marble heads, one of which wears a tiara of very ancient fashion; a bas-relief of three figures, not of the best in execution, but excellent in action, expression, arrangement, and drapery; a monumental tablet; and a large Greek vase (16½ inches high, 33 inches in circ.) bearing six human figures (Bacchus meeting Ariadne?).

The celebrated Dr. Heinrich Barth, in 1846, spent several months in the Cyrenaica, and has told in a hundred pages of his "*Wanderungen durch das Punische und Kyrenäische Küstenland*" (Berlin, 1849) what he saw and what it meant to him. Here, then, was a traveller who undertook no more than he had the ability and means most excellently to perform. His keen observation, quick perception, sound judgment, and breadth of view have served him so well that his book affords us the best short running description that we have. He never forgets the historical aspect, and modestly refrains from relating such tiresome matters as signify nothing. The notes and references, too, are of great value.

M. J. Vattier de Bourville, the first who made any considerable underground researches, was consular agent at Bengasi in 1848-49, and from some point not many miles from Bengasi, and from the neighborhood of Cyrene, he obtained his famous collections of vases and terra-cotta ornaments. At Cyrene, where with his

¹ *Archaeolog. Scot.*, Vol. IV, p. 339-42.

meagre resources he almost despaired of doing anything, he obtained several inscriptions, and a great many fragments of marble and mutilated statues, some of which proved too heavy to be carried away. In the midst of his grotto explorations he also quarried out the painted metopes representing the groups of black women referred to further on, and he was confident of having identified the lake Tritonis and the river Ecceus.¹ The Louvre and the National Library received these collections,² the excellence of which has done much to attract attention to the field from which they came; but the results of his labors hardly fulfil the sanguine hopes which the French government entertained at the time of his appointment.

In 1852, M. E. Pellissier de Reynaud,³ an able political writer, after traversing the Cyrenaica and making some keen, concise, and useful observations upon the contour of the land and the character of the towns, brought away with him about two hundred objects of ancient art, the result of excavations made subsequent to those of de Bourville. Many, if not all of them, are now in Algeria.⁴

Mr. James Hamilton, in his "Wanderings in North Africa" in 1855-56, has not omitted to speak of this country through which he passed, and to give illustrations of some of its most striking features.

The "Discoveries at Cyrene" in 1861-62, by Capt. R. M. Smith, R. E., and Commander E. A. Porcher, R. N., nearly made a new era in book-making as well as in Cyrenian research. The majestic volume which bears this name tells of the well-nigh innumerable difficulties which these gentlemen had in their dealings with the Arabs, and of the methods employed in unearthing sculptures from the temple ruins of Cyrene and transporting them to England. It also contains, besides inscriptions, many colored lithographs of interesting scenes in the Cyrenaica; a number of plans of the city and of the sites excavated; and sixteen excellent photographs of the sculptures obtained. The list of these comprises one hundred and forty-eight titles, including some of the finest of statues, nearly all found below the surface in a number of temple sites within the limits of Cyrene. A little has been incidentally added to our knowledge of the topography of the place, but throughout the undertaking the explorers acknowledged no duties

¹ Archiv. des Missions Scient. Rapport à M. le Min. de l'Instr. Publ. et des Cultes. I, 1850, p. 580.

² The Louvre has no less than 572 pieces.

³ Rev. des Deux Mondes, Oct., 1855.

⁴ At Algiers and Cherchell.

save to the British Museum, which they have so greatly enriched, and showed so little interest in the cause of science that they hardly mentioned any monuments but those they successfully explored; that they never gave architectural details; and that they dismissed in their report two of the most interesting and important temples with the remark that the plans were lost. They had to do almost entirely with the remains of the Roman period, and it is not known how many traces of the older Greek city may hereafter be recovered by deeper and more extended trenching amidst so dense a group of public buildings as evidently awaits investigation. It was the impression of the party that if their mission had been prolonged they would have continued to be as successful in discovering more of such prizes as the Bacchus, the Apollo, and the Aphrodites they have secured.

The archaeologist, Mr. Geo. Dennis, well known for his monumental work on Etruria, ransacked a large number of tombs while vice-consul at Bengasi in 1865, and was rewarded by the discovery of six Panathenaic vases (discussed in *Trans. of the Roy. Soc. of Lit.*, Vol. IX, p. 135) and a variety of smaller vases, bottles, terra-cotta figures and inferior jewelry. His wide experience led him to make some refined observations of peculiar interest, but from the unsparing manner in which he treated such tombs as might yield him booty, he seems, while exploring the Cyrenaica, to have played no higher part than that of an able vase-hunter.

The visit of Gerhard Rohlfs in 1868 made him thoroughly acquainted with the general features of the country, and the results of his keen observations and sound judgment are embodied in a plea for colonization by the German government. (*Unsere Zeit*, 1880, II 29.)

The notes and impressions of a more recent American visitor have not yet been made public.

Having thus briefly recounted the names of those who, during the last one hundred and eighty years, have earnestly devoted themselves to aiding in the achievement of an ever unfinished task, as well as of those who have been permitted casually to glance at these ruins, or thoughtlessly to hasten their destruction by making way for the elements, it remains to speak of what may be done some time in the future towards filling out our conception of the Cyrenaica in antiquity.

We have before us in outline a portrait that is in many ways unique: between the sea and the Libyan desert, solitary and

remote, the ancient, only colony that Europe led to Africa, a land of wealth and beauty, not without its men of genius and not unknown to fame. Because its history is curious it is important; and yet, seemingly by accident, it is little known. We have no new resource, except its material remains; but the lesson which they may teach has never been properly studied. Mere travellers, however keen their observation, cannot serve for archaeologists; and statue-hunters, though working in the interests of one of the highest forms of art, are liable to be so partial and so inconsiderate of the confusion they create, that they only save the booty from falling into vandal hands. We may not obtain the details of the foundation of Cyrene and of the reign of the Battiadae, indeed mere chronicles and chroniclers have had their day, but the revelations most likely to be made are revelations of the most interest and importance.

The general contour of the country, the shore-line and the position of the different towns are pretty well known; for the extensive surveys of the Beecheys' expedition were a very satisfactory part of their work. But we cannot identify Ptolemy's highest mountains nor the lakes which he mentions.

If the geologist has caught up the snatches of information about the reddish soil of Bomba, the salt sands, the yellow or white conchiferous cliffs and the stalactite grottos, about polyps, zoöphytes, fragments of coral, cellulaires, eschara, tubiporae and millepores washed up from the sea; if he has considered the paraetonium, hammoniacum, salt and nitre which were formerly exported, and if he reasons from the analogy of the Tunisian and Algerian coasts now so well known, he may not feel entirely ignorant of the Cyrenaica. The same force which raised the chalk cliffs from the sea-floor has, within our era, made the shore slide into the water and nearly ruined all the harbors. Hardly a generation has passed since the moles of the ancient Leptis Magna and the road outside the city walls disappeared in the Mediterranean.

The flora of North Africa is well known as being reproduced as a part of the flora of southern Europe. It is varied and abundant, but has never been described except from Della Cella's collection of dried specimens,¹ by Prof. Viviani of the University of Genoa. His work, now exceedingly rare, contains a list of about a hundred

¹ *Florae Libycae specimen, s. plantarum enumeratio Cyrenaicarum, Pentapolim, Magnae Syrteos desertum, et regionem Tripolitaneam incolentium, quas ex siccis speciminibus delineavit. Genuae, 1824.*

and fifty species found in the Cyrenaica, which have been embodied with more or less accuracy in the most common floras of N. Africa. Of forest trees there are as many species as one meets in the woods of Maine, and roses, honeysuckles, marigolds and ferns often make a brilliant scene. As the many identifications of the famous silphium, about which so much has been written, seem all to have been proved false,¹ it would surely be interesting to know whether, as with the finest of fur-bearing animals, extinction has really been the penalty of its high value. The limits of the region where it grew were well known, however, to the ancients, and if there extinct, it will probably not be found elsewhere.

That insoluble problem, the ethnography of Africa, may have little interest for the archaeologist, but in view of the fact that in the Cyrenaica, as nowhere else, the black and the white races were mingled together, the results of careful research there can hardly fail to be of value in this regard. If the metopes (now in Paris) that have been found with paintings of black women do not furnish a key to the relations subsisting between the natives and the Greek population, it is not unreasonable to hope that in a district of two hundred miles in length and twenty in width, with at least seven very ancient sites to be explored, and many more of comparatively early origin, one may derive some little information concerning the Nasamones, the Augilae, the Gilligammae, the Ammonians, or those famous serpent-charmers the Psylles. Whenever we begin to extend our knowledge of this rare blending of the sons of Greece with the barbarians of the South, then Pacho's fine descriptions of the nomad tribes, and the materials collected by many other modern travellers, will assume a new importance. With all the information which the ancient historians have given us about these peoples, little has been done towards identifying more than two or three of them with any of the now existing tribes, nor toward determining accurately the borders of their respective territories. It is certain, moreover, that the extensive foreign commerce of Cyrene, about which we may have occasion to speak at another time, must have brought its inhabitants into close relations with many of the more remote native tribes; and it is improbable, even if we suppose the Arabs to have exterminated the people themselves, that all traces of this intercourse have passed away. We may remark, as did Herodotus,

¹ The lotos, too, of Herodotus, II 96, seems always to have been wrongly identified.

that savage natures change slowly, or that, like the earth and the air about them, they do not change at all.

It is well known that such inscriptions as have been recovered consist for the most part of titles or of lists of proper names, and it cannot be predicted that more interesting state documents will ever be found. Smith and Porcher had the same experience as their predecessors; but the field is in no sense exhausted, and everything is valuable. Some inscriptions need still to be reported more accurately, as, for instance, the rescript of Anastasius on one of the barracks at Ptolemaïs, and especially the legends of the theatrical wall-painting. The maze of characters which is graven in the chamber of the fountain probably contains little but names rudely scrawled by visitors. It is from Barca that students of African ethnography and Libyan epigraphy have long been expecting to obtain such new and additional light as may possibly be obtained from the koufique inscriptions on the curious structures at Augila and on the castles of the Arabs scattered over the country.

One must regret that the statuary brought away at various times from the Cyrenaica has not been so described that satisfactory general conclusions can yet be drawn, except as regards the subjects represented. In the gallery at Versailles there is said to be a marble statue representing a Vestal. It was found buried in the sand at Bengasi by Lemaire, who thought it had been originally destined for Rome; but the splendid collection of the British Museum is of course the largest, though single pieces have also found their way to various other places. Sculptured works form the chief part of the collection of Messrs. Smith and Porcher, and the large number obtained in the space of a few months shows how successful they were in discovering these adornments of the splendid but now ruined structures of the Roman Empire. The fineness and beauty of them are made apparent in the photographs which these gentlemen have caused to be made.

Of the paintings so remarkably well preserved at the time of Pacho's visit, it seems that some at least have unfortunately all at once disappeared; some by exposure; some, as the metopal groups of black women, by being quarried out; and any future efforts at explanation of them must be directed to his copies or to the originals in Paris. But this is not true of all the famous wall-paintings, nor of all the works historical, allegorical and pastoral which, for their elegance and their probable Roman origin, make

the Cyrenaica suggestive of Herculaneum and Pompei. Among these paintings are a gladiatorial combat, a hunting scene, a dramatic chorus or a sacred procession, the latter of which is discussed by Wieseler, *Theatergebäude*, p. 53, and by Creuzer, *Symbolik*, II 3, 497. Body-color paintings of figures and animals were in very many, if not, as Beechey thought, in all the tombs; and, not to speak of various diaper patterns, the frequent coloring of architectural members, as triglyphs in blue, and mouldings in red, at once reminds one of the Egyptian fashion. One of these is a Doric frieze over a rock-cut sarcophagus, and is an especially perfect and interesting example. The uniform projection of its rectangular details, among other peculiarities, points distinctly to a Greek period of construction. Church emblems and other paintings of the Christian epoch have been elaborately executed in the tombs.

A complete discussion of all coins originating in the Cyrenaica is to be found in K. L. Mueller's "*Numismatique de l'Ancienne Afrique*." They are generally easy to recognize, and they illustrate, as was to be expected, very many points in the local history. Though a great many have been described, only a few have been brought away in recent times; for though M. Lemaire obtained specimens in bronze, silver, and even gold, no one has worked so carefully in the soil that he could expect to find many of these little relics which the waves of the sea used to expose to the ignorant greed of Bengasi's town's-people, from the partially submerged necropolis. There still remain toward the northern and southern limits of Cyrene, the "city twelve miles in circuit," to say nothing of other sites, certain areas long under tillage by the Arabs, and never yet examined unless by the plowman in the furrow.

The individuality of Cyrenaic pottery which de Bourville, in his "*Coup d'Œil sur la Cyrénaïque Ancienne et Moderne*," has earnestly endeavored to establish, is sufficiently marked, if we judge from the collections of Messrs. Warrington, de Bourville and Dennis, and from the various pieces obtained at different times by purchase from the Arabs or otherwise. The superb acquisition of at least ten Panathenaic vases with the old black figures and Ionic alphabet is a most fascinating incentive to further exploration, though the wholesale rifling of tombs has already greatly diminished, in some quarters, the prospect of success. The kalpis is the most common form, though examples are not

wanting of the lekythus and lekane, of the olpe and oenichoë as jugs, and of the skyphos and kylix as drinking cups. There is also a pelika-formed amphora. The painted vases found at Bengasi have in every case been of the Decadence, or of the Roman period; and at Tokrah the majority belong to the middle or end of the IVth century, though some seem to be as old as the latter part of the Vth century.¹ Blue and red on drapery and other objects appear only occasionally. Among the subjects represented are "Hercules in the Garden of the Hesperides," the finest piece obtained by Mr. Dennis, "Bacchus meeting Ariadne at Naxos" (mentioned above), "Danaë receiving the Golden Shower"; and among the terra-cottas, some of which are said to be very charming, "The Rape of Europa," and a nuptial couch.¹

A careful discussion of Cyrenaic vases, by O. Puchstein, and some excellent illustrations, are to be found in the *Archaeologische Zeitung* for 1881 (Heft 3). The author says: "Ornamentik wie Compositionsweise der kyrenäischen und rhodischen Vasen sind einer Metallindustrie nachgebildet, die zu kyprisch-phönikischen Werkstätten die aller nächsten Bezüge hatte." The Arabs have long since learned to hunt for vases and sell them to foreigners.

In the matter of architecture, the very first vague rumors told of a city with towers and walls and a vast necropolis with mausolea and stately porticos, in the fatherland of Aristippus, the elegant and graceful voluptuary, of Eratosthenes, the librarian of Alexandria, of Carneades, the subtle dialectician, and of Callimachus, the poet and historian at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The indefiniteness of our information has not been materially diminished for more than fifty years. Our knowledge, however, of the topography of the city, its principal edifices, its furrowed street and ancient wall, has been so broadened by modern researches that we now contemplate a city with three theatres, one Greek and two Roman (but not an amphitheatre, as Barth has shown in *Arch. Zeit.* 1848, p. 15), a stadium, elaborate water-works, brick-built baths, an acropolis with retaining wall in the S.W. quarter of the city, a chain of towers or forts of more recent date along the wall of defense upon the S.E. and S.W. sides of the city, besides thousands upon thousands of funeral monuments above and below the ground, spreading themselves over the ridges and slopes to

¹ Geo. Dennis, l. c., one of whose vases dates from 367 B. C.; De Witte, *Gazette Archéologique*, 187; Beulé, *Fouilles et Découvertes*, II 90; *Arch. Zeit.* IV 216.

the north and west and south; and fanes no less than eleven in number to proclaim the honor of the gods. And yet there is not a single one of all these of which we have a satisfactory plan.

In the stadium of Cyrene the Barcan horses, bred of Phoenician and Egyptian stock, famed throughout Greece and Asia Minor, and so long models of equine beauty, must have been trained for their brilliant career in the games of Greece. There was nothing for which the Cyreneans were so renowned as for their horses, their horsemanship, and their skill in the use of chariots.

It was to the Necropolis, really a city of the dead, that M. Pachó chiefly devoted himself, and to him we are indebted for views of a great many façades and of the intricate hypogea (in one of which a hundred and eight niches for sarcophagi have been counted) of this magnificent necropolis that recalls the catacombs of Egypt. But he is not careful always to give the plans, elevations and sections, which are as essential as they are instructive, and even such as we have lose much of their value by the absence of exact numerical data. Not so useful as these are Beechey's drawings, which are made on a smaller scale, and are less carefully studied. It has already been observed that the unusual proportions of certain Doric columns, pictured and detailed by Pachó (Atlas, pll. xxxii and xxxiv), would indicate, if we were sure of their accuracy, a curious repetition of some Egyptian examples of very high antiquity. A similar criticism applies in the temple-drawings of Smith and Porcher, which in their details are far from satisfactory. To conduct on sound principles of inductive reasoning the examination of several miles of catacombs covering with their long lines of pilastered façades the terraces below the town—this may be an arduous undertaking, but our knowledge of ancient architecture is no longer so scanty that we are content merely to be told that such and such orders are exemplified, and that the general character of the edifices is apparent in the accompanying plan. In regard to the extent and grandeur of the cemetery at Cyrene, we may be excused for remarking again that the Doric and Ionic façades, now painted, now engraved with epitaphs, hewn in the rock or built up with masonry, make a series of escarped terraces with miles of roadway intervening, and huge sepulchres like little temples interspersed, the whole almost clothing the hillside in marble. In the Valley of Verdure, "Wady Bil Ghadir," to the S.W. of the town, the simple archaic character is most prominent and at the same time most sumptuously displayed.

The reports which we have received of cisterns, wells, reservoirs, and huge aqueducts seem to indicate a water-system surpassing anything to be found elsewhere in Greek lands. The sacred fountain, which gave the name to the city, still flows abundantly under the name of the "Eternal Spring," through its long rock-encased channel, and the priests of Apollo, whose care it was, have left their names on the rock from which it springs. In general it may be said that the absence of rivers in the Cyrenaica is compensated by its many springs and brooks, the water of which is saved by the wells and cisterns scattered all over the country, and betraying in their various shapes, square, circular and elliptical, and their squared or polygonal masonry, their Greek, Roman, or Arabian origin.

It would be interesting if we could determine with precision what epochs in the revolutionary history of this province are represented in all these architectural remains. For as we mark in the history of the various towns along the seaboard the degrees of glory which each as temporary head successively attained, so amid the desolation of Cyrene itself must we trace that gradual change, that apparent abasement, which the poor exaltation of the modern Bengasi cannot make real.

The Hesperides of the Greeks seems now to have been divided between the sea, the sands and the Arabs; for the shore has receded, and the ancient city, now buried out of sight, has had to yield its squared and sculptured stones for the Arabs to build their miserable huts. After all the conjectures that have been promulgated as to the present possibility of identifying in this vicinity Strabo's Lake Tritonis, the river Lethe and the temple of Aphrodite, it will certainly be a relief to have the question pressed to its final issue by thoroughly investigating it on the ground.

At Tokrah are the remains of a very ancient wall nearly a mile and a half in circuit, enclosing a wide field of ruins which its Cyclopean strength and firmness have outlived. It must be that this is the wall which, according to Procopius, was repaired in the time of Justinian; and, with its two opposite entrances and twenty-six (?) quadrangular towers, it constitutes one of the most attractive objects for scientific study in all the region. The sepulchral remains, generally single chambers underground, seem older than those of Bengasi, though not earlier than the middle of the fifth century; but the sites of single buildings can hardly be distinguished, and in general its architectural remains, though some

streets of dwellings are clearly marked out, are too little known to warrant an enumeration of them. Cremation was common as well as inhumation, and early Christian paintings have been noticed as at Cyrene. Of the wall, Barth says: "Der Stil . . . ist ursprünglich derselbe mit dem der Lysimachischen Mauer über dem Ephesischen Koressos . . . mit dem der älteren Theile auf der Citadelle von Pergamon, . . . kurz mit dem alter Befestigungsbauten jener sogenannten Makedonischen Zeit . . ."

At Ptolemais, which has been built over into an early Christian city, our attention is directed to a ruined city surrounded by tombs, one of which appears to be of very massive proportions, together with fallen columns, mosaics and mausolea, besides two theatres and an amphitheatre or circus, several temples, two churches, a Roman system of water-works and Roman barracks. Of at least one bridge over a ravine the remains were recently found well preserved. Bruce reported that in his time (1768) the walls and gates were still entire, and that one could make out (as even now) the remains of the portico mentioned by Synesius, and the early Ionic temple.

As for Apollonia, its theatre, fanes and arcades, its aqueduct and inscribed hypogeum, merit the most careful attention; for it is certain that the cosmopolitan character of a great city is in some respects more conspicuous at its port than within its own walls; and in the case of the Cyrenaica, the difficult approach from the shore may explain why some kinds of foreign marble seem to have been more abundant at Apollonia than at Cyrene, as well as it explains the preservation of so many remains of the latter city from the vandalism and cupidity of sixteen centuries. The columns of Cyrene said to have been used in buildings in Käyrawân are more likely really to have come from Apollonia.

No just estimate can yet be made of the wealth of the Cyrenaica in general as regards one period in comparison with another. Doric and Ionic,—white marble, granite and porphyry—Greek and Roman,—this describes the scattered fragments, now on the surface, now twenty feet below—and all in the midst of suspicious-looking mounds. The Arabs with their castles, the early Christians with their basilicas, have, like the Roman inhabitants, added each their own characteristics. At Barca, however, the case seems to be different. The date of its founding is known; it rivalled Cyrene in fame and greatness as an independent state until overthrown by the Persians; its power was early transferred to Ptolemais, nearer the sea, and, as its site appears never to have been

rebuilt, nor disturbed in recent years, the date of any traces of early civilization here found will have been fixed beforehand with considerable accuracy. Its castle, its fortifications, its pavements and its wall, which may be the one by which it is known to have been originally protected, all mentioned by Cervelli, are so placed as to indicate a city several miles in extent.

Fergusson, in his *History of Architecture*, has pointed out the exceptional type (several times repeated in the Cyrenaica) of a circular monument constructed over an excavated rock-cut tomb, and adds that no one on the spot has attempted to fix with precision the date of the Cyrenian examples, and that they have not been drawn in such detail as is requisite for others to ascertain the fact. "They are still much less perfectly known than they should be." The tampering of recent years, moreover, has begun to tell upon what yet remains. The acres that still lie buried will keep their ancient treasures safe.

The result, then, of recent researches in the Cyrenaica has been moderately to enrich with its material remains a few of the greatest museums, and vastly to increase by the publication of excellent descriptions, both narrative and pictorial, our meagre fund of information concerning it. Our gratitude for this will not allow us to say, as Rohlf's does, "blieb (es) aber bis in die neueste Zeit hinein immer das Land, welches von wissenschaftlichen Reisenden am stiefmütterlichsten behandelt wurde"; but no one can deny that the researches have been from beginning to end (with some trifling exceptions) thoroughly unscientific. It is not too much to say that at present the fields are very few where the science of archaeology can expect so much light for its dark places as from this newly discovered land, where are strewn from one end to the other the ruins of ancient towns, and where the enormous task, some time to be performed, will glorify forever those who, with determination and with adequate resources, undertake it.

To the archaeologist, the Cyrenaica is not yet, nor is there reason to expect that it soon will be, under the same restrictions precisely as are the Turkish possessions in Europe and Asia. But its political future is at present very uncertain, and the changes that have affected other parts of the North African coast are likely soon to be followed by other changes here. The announcement of a new expedition is awaited in Germany, in France and in England. The work which it will do must be final; and if that work is ever to be done it must not be long delayed.

FARLEY BREWER GODDARD.

IV.—THE NAHUATL-SPANISH DIALECT OF NICARAGUA.

To one who reads Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico," the splendor and magnificence of Montezuma's court seem marvellous, but not more marvellous than the resources themselves of his wonderful empire, as described by the native Spanish historians. According to these, when Cortes entered the capital of Anáhuac, it was not alone the national prosperity of its people that filled him with astonishment, it was not simply their curious customs nor their strange manners that caused him great surprise, but their extraordinary language; the amazing facility with which those about the king could clothe their thoughts in words, and the harmonious effects of the foreign tongue. This idiom, as Hubert Bancroft tells us in his "Native Races of the Pacific States," was the *lingua franca* of Mexico,—the language par excellence of Mexican civilization, that stretched across the immense plateau from the Gulf of California on the northwest to the Gulf of Mexico on the southeast for a distance of more than twelve hundred miles. It was, therefore, emphatically a dominant stock speech, and was used in court circles and in all official communications, just as the French of a few years ago; and the people of all newly-conquered territories were required to learn it. "Of all languages spoken on the American continent," remarks the same author, "the Aztec (Nahuatl) is the most perfect and finished, approaching in this respect the tongues of Europe and Asia, and actually surpassing many of them by its elegance of expression."

The celebrated Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg, author of a Quiché grammar, and of many other valuable works on Mexican lore, asserts of it that "*Des hauteurs les plus sublimes de la métaphysique, elle descend aux choses les plus vulgaires; avec une sonorité et une richesse d'expression qui n'appartiennent qu'à elle.*" But copiousness and flexibility are not the most striking characteristics of the Nahuatl tongue. It is an extremely polysynthetic kind of speech, in which the process of agglutination has the greatest sweep, so that not only words are built up in it to the extent of sixteen syllables, but the meaning of a whole sentence

even is often crowded into a single word. We are all familiar with such geographical proper-name combinations as Popocatepetl, "the smoking mountain." It has the Latin vowel-system, but certain consonants are wanting, such as *b, d, f, v, g, s*. Gender is marked by simple juxtaposition, and there is no regular declension, the different case-relations being denoted by various post- and prepositions. But the verb is richer in both mood and tense development than is usually found in the Neo-Latin idioms. I mention these few characteristics of the Nahuatl, as given by Bancroft, De Olmos and others, simply to show that it was a species of language with wholly opposite tendencies—a very strong synthetic development—to those of the extremely analytic speech with which it was brought into contact at the time of the conquest of Mexico; and we shall note further on more than one marked effect of the more complex system on the phonetics, word-formation and phrase-setting of the Spanish.

One of the "outlying colonies" of this powerful people, whom we have just seen occupying the great plain of Anáhuac, was the Nahuatl tribe, that took possession of and gave the name to that province of Central America now known as Nicaragua. It was these natives of Aztec blood and language that Gil Gonzales de Avila found there in 1521, when he discovered the country, and who were formally conquered in 1522 by his wily and unscrupulous rival, Pedro Avias, Governor of Panama. Not till some time after this, however, did the conquerors obtain full control of their province, when it was attached to the Captain-Generalcy (Audien-*cia*) of Guatamala, under which rule it remained till the outbreak of the revolution of 1821, thus making three hundred years of steady, uninterrupted Spanish dominion. At an early date after the Spanish occupation there sprang up a "mixed dialect, composed of a broken-down Nahuatl and a corrupt Spanish, which, at first, served as a means of communication between the conquerors and their subjects, and later became, to some degree, the usual tongue of the latter."¹

This *misch-dialect* spread over large districts of Central America and Mexico, and finally became "the current tongue of the half-breeds." The bulk of its word-supply is Spanish, which, for the most part, has preserved its sixteenth-century character, and with this, of course, many terms that are obsolete to-day. Besides these, as we shall see further on, it contains interesting marks of

¹ Cf. Brinton, Güegüence, Introduction, p. xvi.

Spanish home-dialect influence, and a number of new products created by engrafting on to Aztec words, either as a whole or reduced to the simple stem, the Romance flexional endings, just as we find them in the transference of German words to Neo-Latin soil. Frequently, however, we come upon entire phrases borrowed directly from the native idiom, which, the editor tells us, are so mutilated that they are scarcely recognizable, and in many cases render the interpretation of the text extremely difficult. In its syntax the general tradition of the old Spanish sentence is stuck to, but with a feeling so lax and unsteady that the breaking-down power of the native tongue becomes manifest in the removal of all flexional elements, and in a naked juxtaposition of nominal and verbal roots.¹

This dialect-text, which it is here proposed to examine, has just been published by Dr. Daniel G. Brinton, in his Library of Aboriginal American Literature, under the title "The Güegüence; a Comedy Ballet in the Nahuatl-Spanish Dialect of Nicaragua," and constitutes No. III of that series. It is printed, as the editor states, from a collection of two MSS made by Dr. Berendt in 1874, no part of which has ever before been translated. Both the age and the authorship are unknown. With reference to the former, the learned translator remarks, "it is probable that we may assign the early portion of the eighteenth century as the latest date for its composition, and there is some evidence that a more remote period is not improbable." He further thinks "there are weighty reasons for believing that it is the production of a native Indian or of a half-cast."

The piece covers a little over thirty-five octavo pages, and bears the double title "Baile del Güegüence ó Macho-Raton," which, I think, will be shown further on to have some significance with reference to its origin. The *dramatis personae* are the Governor, the chief Alguacil, the Güegüence ("the old man"), his two sons Forcico and Ambrosio, Lady Suchi-Malinche (daughter of the Governor), the Royal Secretary and the Registrar. The *mutae personae* are the women and the maskers, the mules (*machos*). Throughout the whole of the first half of the drama the action and dialogue are confined exclusively to the *dramatis personae*, without any reference whatever being made by them to the *mutae personae*, who appear in an abrupt way shortly after the middle point has been reached. The action in the first part turns upon a series of bal-

¹Güegüence, p. xviii.

lets performed by the Güegüence and his two sons, in which both the Governor and the Alguacil sometimes take part, the *entr'actes* being filled in with a cross-fire of innuendos, racy speeches and sharp retorts between the old man and his sons (in the presence of the above-named government officials), one of whom always corroborates the bombastic statements of his father, while the other with equal pertinacity endeavors to show him up as an inveterate liar. The Governor now and then calls the interlocutors to order, and demands of them some old historic dance, which is accordingly performed. After the maskers are brought on, which is done at the request of the Governor, numerous jokes of a questionable character are perpetrated at the expense of the women and the *machos*, and then they finally wind up with the marriage of the Güegüence's favorite son, Don Forcico, to Suchi-Malinche, the Governor's daughter. According to custom on such occasions, the young groom's father makes a present of wine to the girl's father, and then Güegüence with his tribe sets off on the mules, leaving the Governor and the other members of his council to enjoy their feast.

Before considering the particular phase of language that this mixed text represents, we must call up the condition of the Spanish when it was brought into contact with the aboriginal tongue. The formal conquest of Nicaragua took place, as we have just seen, in 1522. Precisely a quarter of a century after this, that is in 1547, Cervantes was born, and, again, exactly forty years later, Lope de Vega first saw the light. It may reasonably be supposed that it took at least half a century for the Spanish to make any perceptible inroad upon the idiom with which it had come into contact; in truth, it was not till towards the end of the sixteenth century that the Spaniards had become so thorough masters, politically, of their new territory as to exercise anything like a centralized power over it, and we must naturally suppose, therefore, that the impression before this date of the analytic tongue of the Europeans upon the polysynthetic idiom of their subjects could not have been very great, or, at least, not sufficient to have built up an independent jargon with pretty definite laws of morphology and of syntax. To have destroyed the flexional character of the Spanish and to have reduced it to the agglutinated state in which it appears often in the text before us, must have required a long series of years of attrition and admixture. We have, therefore, in a consideration of this dialect, to take as our basis the classic Spanish of the time of Cervantes

and Lope de Vega, with its now obsolete grammar-forms and antiquated constructions, and to this add the varying dialect influences which must have been brought to bear on the new product by the common speech of the Spanish soldiers.

As in the phonetic products of all languages belonging to the tropics, we should naturally expect to find here, in the results of Nahuatl influence on Spanish, a general tendency to broaden the close sounds and to lift them in the scale of phonic production. In many cases this tendency agrees with special dialect effects. That such disposition is actually the case in the Güegüence we see from almost the first line, in examples like *Velancicos* (= Sp. *Villancicos*), *seno* (O. Sp. *sines*, *senes*), *semula* (*simila*), etc., etc., where the *i*, both tonic and atonic, has been strengthened and raised to the *e* stage. In Latin we have a similar interchange between *u* and *i* in such forms as *testumonium* (for *testimonium*), *pontufex* (for *pontifex*), and in the Spanish *zurujano* (for *cirujano*). In this special phonetic trait of the Nahuatl-Spanish, both the old and Folk's language of Spain agree, so that it becomes difficult in certain cases to determine to which of these two influences the fuller vowel-product ought to be assigned. To judge from the numerous examples in which the processes of development are different, and where the common speech has deviated from the traditional literary type, we must conclude that there was a very strong drift in favor of the popular element, even though the vowel-coloring of the language in which these changes were produced was well settled by natural growth and established literary usage. This same tendency to raise the weak vowels we find illustrated in the Old Latin by the vacillation between *e* and *i* in such forms as *tempestatebus*, *mereto*, compared with the classic *tempestatibus*, *merito*. In the Spanish Folk's speech it was the *e*-form that was kept, and especially at this period of the language pretonic *i* was constantly represented by *e*, as in *Cecilia* for *Cicilia*, *dejiste* for *dijiste*, *adevinar* for *adivinar*, etc. Even in the tonic the same phenomenon is not unfrequent, e. g. *mesmo* for *mismo*. Such examples as these show that the same propensity was strongly rooted in the Spanish of home-growth in the sixteenth century, and has been kept up, even down into the present idiom, for the purpose of syllable differentiation in the forms *ceniza* (*cinis*), *ceñir* (*cingere*), *concebir* (*concupere*), *corregir* (*corrigere*), etc. The Castilian, furthermore, furnishes us with striking evidence of a constant disturbance of its legitimate vowel-system when applied to other non-accented vowels, as in

ermado (for *armado*), *reson* (for *razon*), etc., which are simple instances of the levelling process pushed one step further than we have it in the Nicaraguan Spanish. On the other hand, the more common raising of the vowel-power from *e* to *a* is in accordance with the usual Spanish dialect influence, e. g. *Amilio Castalar* (for *Emilio Castelar*), *ajercito* (for *ejercito*), used by the Folk in Castile, is especially marked in the moulding of Nahuatl forms to suit the requirements of Spanish flexion or to satisfy the demands of Spanish euphony. The Nahuatl "particle of contra-position" *yê* has passed to the *a*-state in *ya*; *mocemati* ("presumptuously") is *mosamonte*, where, too, we find at the same time a thickening of the final *i* and an epenthetical *n* before dental, such as we have it in the differentiated Castilian forms *empleita*, *emplenta*, *render* (*reiterare*), (cf. Michaëlis, Studien zur romanischen Wortschöpfung, p. 244). *Nemi* ("to live") gives us *neme*. In the same way *a* is broadened into *o* in such forms as *hoy*, etc. *E = o* in *seno* = Old Spanish *sines* or *senes*, with apocopation of the final consonant, as in the *hemo* of our text. We find this same broadening of vowel in the modern *obispo* (*episcopus*), in the Old Spanish *romanecer* (for *remanecer*). In one example, *persogue* (*Dios persogue á mi amigo*), we have the *e* represented by *o*, which, however, I would take as a probable corruption of copyist, since we have the same verb several times in its simple *i*-form when it is not compounded with the preposition, e. g. in *siguale*. The common vowel changes, therefore, that we find in the Nahuatl, and which separate it from the classical Spanish and bind it with the old and dialect forms of the same, are *e = i*, *o = e*, *o = a*. The only exceptions that I have discovered of the opposite process, that is, reduction of the phonetic value of the vowel, belongs to *e* in combination with a nasal, as is shown in the strongly dialectic form *tin*, which the editor would take from the root *ten* (*tenere*), and would regard "as a good illustration of the wearing away of forms in this mixed dialect."

Turning now to the consonants, we meet here equally interesting traces of the old Castilian idiom, or, which amounts to about the same thing, of dialect peculiarities. These affect, for the most part, certain classes of consonants only, namely, gutturals and sibilants, medial or final. In the first title itself of the *Baile* we have the aspirated Nahuatl *h* of *huehue*, "old man," passing regularly into the medial guttural, similar to the transference of the Gothic *h* from Teutonic to certain parts of the Romance soil.

For initials, the most striking thing to notice is the treatment of the Nahuatl aspirate *h* and the Castilian guttural *x*. That the quality of this *h* in Nahuatl was aspirate, and similar to that of the O. H. G., which, in certain cases, has crossed over into Italian in the sonant state, there can be no doubt, from the testimony of De Olmos, a Franciscan monk, who, as far back as 1547, that is, only a quarter of a century after the conquest of Mexico, composed a grammar of the native Mexican, in which (p. 197) he says: "la *h* unas vezes parece que la comen, y otras vezes la pronuncian mucho." In this leading title of the comedy, the proper name Güegüence, we have two striking characteristics of Spanish dialect influence, namely, the passage of *h* into sonant guttural *g*, and the lowering of the vowel *u* to *ü* in the Nahuatl word *huehue*, "old man," a mode of dealing with the initial combination *hu* that is found in various districts of the Spanish peninsula, but it is especially the Asturian who always says *güertu*, *güeso* for Castilian *huerto*, *hueso*, etc. Compare also the Venitian *garbo* = O. H. G. *haru*, N. H. G. *herb*; the Tuscan *gufo* = O. H. G. *háf*, *hávo*, where there has been a similar exchange of the initial guttural, without, however, the reduction of the vowel. In *güil* (= Old Spanish *quel* = *que* + *el*) we have the same tendency manifest for the mutes, which, in truth, throughout this comedy are constantly run over into mediae whether they are initial or medial, but it is particularly in the latter position that this change takes place, as may be seen below.

Next to the passage of pure voiceless to voiced gutturals comes the change respectively of the interdental and guttural spirants *z*, *x* to the simple alveolar *s*. For the former (*z*, *s*, *c*) we have evidence out of the sixteenth century, that is about the time the Spaniards came into contact with the Mexicans, that they began even then to run into one another in sound, and the old distinction of *ç* to represent the mute, and *z* the sonant, spirant was gradually broken down, and in one dialect at least the tradition has been kept up. The Cuban, for example, makes no difference of sound whether the graphic sign be *c*, *z*, or *s*; they are all the simple sibilant *s* for him. So, too, the Andalusian, in spite of the rule laid down by the Spanish Academy at the beginning of the eighteenth century (after all differentiation of *ç* and *z* had disappeared from Castilian) that *c* should be written before *e*, *i*, and *z* before *a*, *o*, *u*, and that both consonants should be pronounced exactly alike—the Andalusian, I say, persists in saying *murc* (*ç*) *ia*,

and not *murc(th)ia*. The Aztec Spaniard does the same thing, as is evidenced in *sapatetas* for *zapatetas*, etc.

The interchange of *x* and *s* which we find in *silguero* for *xilguero* comes up as dialect peculiarity early in the language, since the *Dialogo de las lenguas*, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, mentions it, e. g. *en muchas partes de Castilla convierten la s en j (x) y per saster dicen xastre*. In the middle of the sixteenth century, Charpentier tells us, the *x* was pronounced like the *sci* of the Italians, that is, as a simple English *sh*-sound. So, too, Pedro di Alcalá, at the beginning of the century, expressed the Arabic *dsch*, *sch*, by the Spanish *j*, *x* (Förster, Span. Sprachlehre, p. 16), in other words, as a palatal, just as we have it to-day in Gallician and Asturian, and corresponding exactly to the modern Portuguese pronunciation.¹

The Arabs of Spain were accustomed to represent the unknown quantity of their mathematics by this simple term "thing" (شيء) just as the early Italian algebraists did with their *cosa* (= "thing"), which was either written out in full or indicated by a sign. The Arabs, also following the same system, placed the first letter (*s*) of their word *šai* over the numeral, for example $\overset{\text{š}}{12}(\text{ش}) = 12x$, and as the Span. *x* of that period was exactly the same in value as this *š* (= Eng. *sh*), nothing was more natural than the substitution by the Spanish mathematicians, of the Latin for the Arabic sign. Instead of *x* the author thinks, therefore, we should read *šai*.

This sound, then, that was carried into Mexico differed very materially from the guttural spirant of the present Castilian, and we find its palatal character maintained in the words cited above. But as a medial only does the full force of its true palatal nature become manifest through numerous examples, and especially where this mutation of form belongs to Nahuatl words in which

¹ Prof. Paul Haupt has kindly called my attention to an interesting article in the Gött. Gel. Anz. 1882, No. 13, by Paul de Lagarde, entitled "Woher stammt das *x* der Mathematiker?" The author here shows very clearly that the custom of our present notation of an unknown quantity by the letter *x* sprang from the equivalence in phonetic value of the initial consonant of the Arabic شيء (*šai*), "thing" (= *res* = Italian *cosa*) with the Spanish *x*. شيء (*šai* = *xai*) was reduced to simple ش (*š* = *x*) which in sound was faithfully represented by this Spanish letter.

the *x* plays an important rôle. Such words as *mascamayagua* (*maxca* + *mayacuela*), *n-isti-pampa* (*n-ixtlipampa*), etc., show what must have been the phonetic value of this compound sign in the mouth of the Mexican Spaniard. But if we thus discover some interesting traces of dialect usage in the initial spirants and guttural explosivæ, these characteristics become much more abundant when we pass to the medial consonants. Here not only the sonants of the original language are scrupulously kept, but there is also a very strong inclination to run all mutes over into this class, whether they belong to Latin or Nahuatl elements. In the latter especially, the drift is so powerful for the gutturals as to almost obliterate in some cases the primitive aspect of the vocable. We thus find medial *g* playing again the double rôle of an original *h* or *qu*, e. g. *eguan* (*ihuan*), *Teguan* (*Tehuantin*), *calagua* (*calaquia*), *mayagua* (*mayacuele*), *negualigua* (*necuilhuia*), *sepene-galigua* (*-calaquia*), *tumaguiso* (*tumaquica*), etc., all of which may be found in Dr. Brinton's little vocabulary given at the end of his Güegüence.

With reference to the finals we have that natural word-shortening and reduction of form according to the "Law of Least Action," which pre-eminently characterizes all Folk's speech. Not only are vowels lopped off, but consonants follow them with apparently the same facility, and, in this way, the long native Mexican words are brought into reasonable compass, for example, *mayague* (*mayacuele*), *necana* (*nequanaliztli*), *guajaqueño* (*quauhuaqui*). But this extensive process of apocopation is not confined to the Mexican elements of the dialect. Just as final *l* and *r* are constantly cut off in Andalusian, so that we have such forms as *papé* (for *papel*), *caudá* (for *caudal*), *seño* (for *señor*), *muje* (for *mujer*), so we find here in the Mexican Spanish an apocopation of final *s* in the forms *seno* (Old Span. *senes*), *hemo* for *hemos*, with the original signification of the Latin *habere*. I would attribute the loss of consonant, however, in these cases not to special Spanish dialect action, but rather to the influence of the native tongue, which possessed no *s*-sign. This full sibilant is represented more or less faithfully in the Aztec by the combination *tz*, which passes regularly into the simple *s*-form in our text, for example, in the vocative combination *no piltze* = *no pilse*, etc.

The disappearance of final *n* is common, e. g. *teguane* (*tehuantin*). Syncopation is a very frequent process for certain letters of Nahuatl combination, especially of *l* in connection with *t*,

petate (*petlatli*), *petaca* (*pellacalli*), *tatila* (*talli*), *ticino* (*ticill*), *chocola* (*chocolatl*), *n-isti-pampa* (*-ixtli-*). The Spanish, too, has suffered in this way, though very little compared with the native language, as in the examples *guanacos* (for *guanacos*), *asetato* (for *asientato*). In its morphology, the Nahuatl Spanish separates itself more clearly from the modern language than in its phonology. The Mexican has had little influence here so far as the individual word is concerned. In the nomen-series the Spanish has been able to maintain its shape, though often mixed up promiscuously with native elements, as we shall see when we come to the syntax. Old Spanish forms, with special dialect influence, are here the chief factors that constitute the difference between the new mixture and the Castilian of to-day. We have already noted *güil*, to which we may add *de onde*, *indenantes*, *a onde*, *para onde*, *seno* (Old Spanish *sines*).

Diminutives and augmentatives abound, just as we might naturally expect to find in the Folk's speech. But it is especially in the verb that we note the most striking characteristics both of a stage of language older than the present Castilian and of the extensive play of dialect power. We cite the following: *hemo* (for *hemos*), *asetato* (for *asientato*), alongside of which we have the full form *sientato*; *dobla* (for *doblado*), representing the apocopated imperative in Old Spanish, *vuestro furor ejecutó en mi vida* (*Garcilaso*), quoted by Foerster, *Span. Sprachlehre*, p. 320. There is a strong tendency to keep the vowel of the infinitive, even in cases where it is only graphic, and where the modern language has syncopated it, as is shown by the subjunctive form *sigua* for modern *sigas*. The contract second person plural of the Old Spanish comes up in *tiene*s (cf. Old Span. *tenés* = *tenedes*), with diphthongisation of the root-vowel carried through the non-accented forms, such as we have it in Modern French *aimez* (originally *amez*). In this verb *tener* throughout, and in *ver*, "to see," we discover some extraordinary freaks of the popular idiom, namely, the reduced root *tin* represents the second person singular, first and third persons plural, that is, *tiene*s, *tené*mos and *tié*nen, while *tié*nes supplies the place of the second plural *tené*is; and, similarly, the present tense, third plural of *ver* (*ven*, p. 60) is used to replace the second person plural *vé*is. This is a common usage in dialect speech, as, for example, in all the North French dialects a like phenomenon is shown, in that the persons of the different tenses are not kept strictly apart; and even where each one has a

form to itself, different persons are frequently changed one for another. Compare, especially, the Maine and Paris species.

Another example of contract formation we find in *aventastes* (p. 56), Old Span. for *aventásteis*, and, again, *seres* for *seréis* (p. 56), *aviastes* for *avidsteis* (p. 62). But the most interesting peculiarity of the verb formation is seen in the future, which is built up almost exclusively in the regular periphrastic manner of the Romance languages, save that the component elements are not welded together, that is, the auxiliary is kept distinct from the infinitive by means of the relational *de*, so that we have *ha de hablar*, *ha de ser*, *has de tener*, *ha de hacer*, *ha de estar*, etc. It is thus we have the special idiomatic futures that represent "duty, intention, design, possible possession," passing over sometimes into a state of verbal action which does not bear these special significations. These full elemental forms stand instead of the rarer compound futures which mark simple future action and are composed of the parts bound together into a single whole. There are only a few of this latter type in the whole play before us, and they serve simply to denote indefinite future conditions without any limitations whatever.

In the new word-building of this dialect we find the same modes of procedure which come up in the adaptation of Teutonic roots to Romance uses, that is, we frequently have the original Nahuatl word, with or without apocopation, treated as a stem to which the Latin termination is hung on for the new compound. Of these there are numerous examples in the short text of the Güegüence, such as *guajaqueño* = Nah. *quanhuaqui* + Latin suffix *ineus*, which is generally used to form patronymics, as in *madrileño*, *estremeño* (from *Estremadura*), *malagueño*, etc.; *palparesia* = Nah. *papal* ("conversation") + *itia*; *tic-ino* = Nah. *ticill* ("a native doctor") + *inus*, *tat-ito* = Nah. *tatl* ("father") + the diminutive *ita*.

Besides this process of creating new forms out of the native elements plus Latin terminations, many peculiar types of purely Spanish or Latin origin are produced by syncopation, prosthesis, apocopation, etc., that are characteristic of the popular idiom. In *asetato*, for example, for *asientato*, we have the relational *a*, which, together with the syncopation of *n* before *t*, gives us an essentially different product in appearance from the ordinary Spanish *sientate*. These participial parasynthetics in *a*, bearing a full causal force, are abundant in the Raetian, and more especially the Ladinian branch of it, where the legitimate process of producing a factitive signifi-

cation is confined to the present participle. *Rujeros* for *rujidos*, by a change of *d* to *r*, is illustrated in the Andalusian *Garitana* for *Gaditana*, *mentira* for *mentida* (cf. Michaelis, p. 236); but this is only the continuation of a similar phenomenon that comes up in the Latin *meridies* for *medidies*, and Old Latin according to Priscian gives us *arfari*, *arvolare*, *arvenire* (cf. Förster, Span. Sprach.).¹ In *Silguerio* the Latin termination *arium* has been preserved in its full force instead of the reduced *ero*, such as we find it in the Castilian of to-day.

The use of epenthetical *n* we have seen in *mosamonte* = Nah. *mocemati*, where the intercalation of this letter is similar to the Spanish *linterna*, *rendir*, etc. The word *cele* in the oft-recurring expression *no me cele*, I would take directly from the Latin *calere*. The Latin *calet aliqua re* has passed into the impersonal construction *mihi calet*, etc., which again, for the verb, has turned into the French *chaloir*. The negative participial form of this verb is preserved to us in the Modern French *non-chalant*. Note also the Provençal *caler*: *Amors gilat m'avetz a no m'en cal*, Aimeric de Pegulhan. The Old Spanish form was identical with that of the Provençal, and we find accordingly *poco me cala* (Poema de Alejandro 140, as quoted in Diez' Wörterbuch, *sub voce*). The Italian possesses this verb also, as is seen from examples like *non me ne cale* (*ibidem*), etc. Its existence is thus assured in four out of the six principal languages of the Romance group. The peculiar quality of the root-vowel in our text is due to the Folk's speech as described above.

But with all the above-mentioned changes of both phonology and morphology we do not have the dialect character of the Güegüence so well established as in its syntax. It is here especially that we find the strong influence in certain cases of the native idiom, and again witness more directly than anywhere else the strong drift towards a strictly agglutinated form of language in which all flexion has disappeared, and where nothing but the context alone serves us in trying to discover the thought of the writer. A mixing of subjunctive and imperative moods in the same sentence to express a command, the use of nouns as adjectives, the use of the preposition *a* not only before a personal object (the legitimate Spanish usage), but also before an impersonal accusative, the dative without any case-sign, as is seen some-

¹ For the discovery of this interesting interchange in French phonetics cf. A. Tobler, *Romania* II 241-244. For various theories as to how it took place cf. G. Paris, *Français R=D*, *Rom.* VI 129-133; L. Havet, *Français R pour D*, *Rom.* VI 254-257; Joret, *Mém. de la Soc. de lang.* III 161.

times in Norman, the separation of *para* from its infinitive by an intercalated phrase, *para en chocolá brindar*, a general characteristic of the older stages of word-relation in the Romance languages, —these are only a few phases of construction that separate this dialect from the present Castilian. In the majority of cases, however, the Spanish construction has been adhered to; in truth, this has been carried out so faithfully in so many instances, and the sequence of tenses so scrupulously maintained, the strikingly idiomatic expressions of Spanish used so naturally and fluently, that one might almost be led to believe it the language of a Spaniard himself. This is not the view held, however, by the editor, who draws most of his arguments, with reference to its authorship, from the artistic form of the comedy. The mode of presentation he does not find Spanish; but it may naturally be asked, I think, whether the author, had he been of Spanish blood, would not have done all in his power to adopt for his piece that style and *mise en scène* which appealed especially to his hearers? It would seem to me *a priori* improbable that a native who, in the beginning of the *Baile*, mixes so much Nahuatl with his Spanish, should stick so closely to the traditions of Romance syntax. The evidence drawn from the peculiar use of words and the knowledge of their intimate relations in special phrase-settings would point naturally to a Spanish author. If he were a native he must have been imbued with the spirit of the Spanish to such a degree as to forget, in a great measure, the usages of his mother-tongue. The mutilations of the Mexican, as given by the able editor in the vocabulary of peculiar words following the Güegüence text, would rather point to a man imperfectly acquainted with that language, which he was trying to use alongside of his own by transferring to it most of the characteristics of word-formation that existed in his native speech. This point, however, I do not regard of so much importance as another that pertains to its non-unity of composition, namely, I think there is strong internal evidence for believing that the whole comedy is not by one and the same author, but rather made up of two comedies or parts of comedies that bore the names respectively of Güegüence and El Macho-raton. I am aware that it is the custom to give to Spanish dramas a dual title even when they are produced by one and the same author, but then the language and other concomitants of scenic representation agree throughout, and thus show a uniformity of treatment which I do not find in the Güegüence. My suspicions in this direction were first aroused by the change of language that takes place about the

point where *El macho-raton* is first mentioned, that is, from about the fiftieth page of the text onward as it is here published with translation. The proportion of Nahuatl words is smaller from this point forward than in the first part of the work, especially in the speeches of the Governor and Alguacil. The language of the Güegüence and his sons, in a majority of cases, is almost pure Spanish in character and composition, whereas towards the beginning of the work they are often understood with difficulty by one who does not know the native idiom. Diminutives are more abundant in part first than in part second; in other words, the early portion seems to me more especially of a character belonging to the common people. The use of the masculine for the neuter demonstrative pronoun is the rule of the beginning, while it is employed correctly in the second division of the comedy. A fourth consideration, of a purely external, mechanical nature, however, seems to point to a difference of authorship and perhaps of age, namely, the irregularity in the use of diacritical signs. Before the *macho-raton* is mentioned we have only two or three examples of the use of the grave accent, and these not in the body of the text, but simply in the stage regulations; whereas, after the maskers are introduced, there is a strange mixture of acute (Spanish) and grave accents even in the same line (cf. p. 62). It may be claimed that this confusion was due to the copyist, but if so, why should we not have the same irregularity in the first part? In the special Güegüence portion, the acute, that is, the legitimate Spanish accent, is used with regularity, except in a few cases of omission altogether, which is natural in a work of this character, as in dialect and popular texts everywhere.

From these differences in purity of language and correctness of mechanical representation, I think the conclusion may be drawn with a certain degree of probability that the *macho-raton* part of the work is of an epoch different from the Güegüence proper. If this were not so, why should not the proportion of Nahuatl remain about the same, or even increase, as there was greater opportunity for its use in the increased variety of subjects presented by the introduction of new personages? Is it possibly because the native element was not so well understood at the time when the second part was written, and hence the less mixed character of the Spanish belonging to it?

From the discrepancies here mentioned I would venture to suggest the probability of the adaptation of a separate text of different authorship and age from the early portion of this work, for the second part, and that this portion is younger than the beginning of it.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

V.—THE BABYLONIAN "WOMAN'S LANGUAGE."

In the summer of 1880, when I was residing in England for the purpose of examining the cuneiform treasures of the British Museum, the idea occurred to me one day that the first column of the Three-columned Vocabulary K. 4319, of which two important fragments had been published in the second volume of Sir Henry Rawlinson's *Cuneiform Inscriptions*¹ (pl. 31, No. 1; 40, No. 5), contained words belonging to another dialect of the Akkadian language—an obvious conjecture, which, as it has since appeared, Messrs. François Lenormant, Theo. G. Pinches and A. H. Sayce had made before me, all independently of one another as I made it independently of them. The fact may thus be regarded as all the more certain.

The first to point out the existence of two Akkadian dialects—unless some significance is to be attached to the words "Trilingual Lists" standing over the two fragments in II R—was Professor Sayce, to whom we owe also the first outline of Akkadian grammar.² In the introduction to his learned paper, "The languages of the cuneiform inscriptions of Elam and Media," read before the Society of Biblical Archaeology, November 3, 1874,³ he remarked that we had besides the Akkadian "an allied Babylonian idiom, which chiefly differed from Akkadian by preferring *m* to *b*, *ma* to *ba* ('ille')," etc. The honor of *this* discovery will remain with Professor Sayce forever.

As to my part in the matter, I had had no knowledge of this brief suggestion of the sagacious glottologist, but was directed to the dialect through an entirely accidental association of ideas. Early in August I made the acquaintance at table of a lady, whose English had a slight dialectical tinge in which I, as a foreigner,

¹ I indicate the five volumes of this great work in distinction from the custom employed in England and France (W. A. I., I, II, etc.), as I R, II R, etc., partly for the sake of brevity, and especially out of respect for the venerable master of our science, the "father of Assyriology," Sir Henry Rawlinson.

² In his admirable essay "On an Accadian Seal" (*English Journal of Philology*, III). [Compare for this now my remarks on p. xxxiii of my *Akkadische Sprache*, Berlin, 1883, Asher & Co.]

³ See *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, III 465-485.

felt a special interest. A long conversation ensued upon dialectical peculiarities and provincialisms in English, which, however, I did not hear to the end, since I wished to go to my work again. The first thing that came into my hands was this very Three-columned Vocabulary superscribed as a "Trilingual List." After that it was nothing wonderful that I remarked the dialectical peculiarities on the old wedge-written tablet. Most discoveries are arrived at after a similar fashion. The whole decipherment of the cuneiform writing goes back finally to a fortunate accident. M. Jules Oppert has said,¹ to be sure, very cleverly, that this was "un de ces heureux hasards dont les hommes de génie ont seuls le privilège," but, however little I am inclined to deny this epithet to Georg Friedrich Grotefend, my own "discovery" required but a very small modicum of this quality, otherwise so desirable for an Assyriologist.

I followed up my observation, studying carefully the peculiarities of the dialect as they revealed themselves in the Vocabulary, and by their help I distinguished gradually among the Hymns and Incantations published in Vol. IV of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions* the texts that showed the same dialectical character. The results of these somewhat laborious researches I embodied in my essay which appeared on Nov. 3, 1880, in the *Nachrichten* of the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen, "Über einen Dialekt der sumerischen Sprache."

I might have entitled this little treatise more correctly "On a dialect of the Akkadian language," or "On the dialect of Sumer," for while my work was going through the press, I reached the conviction, on the ground of various combinations, that the new dialect was the idiom of Sumer or Lower Babylonia. Soon afterwards it also became clear to me that the ideograph *eme-sal*, which Professor Friedrich Delitzsch was the first to explain as "Female Language" or "Woman's Language," was the technical term by which the old Babylonian grammarians designated the Lower Babylonian dialect.²

Almost all Assyriologists—with the natural exception of the two French anti-Akkadists—accepted my conclusions, most conspicu-

¹*Expédition scientifique en Mésopotamie*, II 3. Paris, 1859.

²*Assyrische Lesestücke*, Leipzig, 1878, pp. 5 and 29 under No. 19. Delitzsch here reserved a fuller explanation of this technical term. Later he told me orally that he was of the opinion, the expression referred to the vanishing of the final consonants in Akkadian—a subject which I have fully discussed in my *Familiengesetze*. But M. Lenormant, as I only observed about the end of

ously Professor Delitzsch in his admirable work "Wo lag das Paradies?" (Leipzig, 1881). Lately, however, a young assistant at the Royal Library of Munich, who devotes his leisure hours to Assyriology, and has made himself pretty well known by means of numerous popular articles on Assyriological matters in various respectable journals and newspapers,¹ has taken occasion to dispute this commonly accepted theory. In the *Academy* of May 20th, 1882, he published a long article entitled "Sumer and Akkad," in which he put forth the surprising statement that the new dialect, the laws of which I had established, was not spoken in Sumer, but in Akkad or Upper Babylonia. He set forth his novel view² more fully in an article in No. 23 of the Munich journal "Das Ausland" of June 5th of the same year. His attack, however, touched my honor rather more than my theory. I will naturally take up here only the scientific portion of his two articles, referring

1881, rightly perceived that the term *eme-sal* indicates dialectical forms. His statement, however, made on p. 399 of the German edition of "La magie chez les Chaldéens," that the lexical tablets registered not seldom words showing *m* for Akkadian *b*, and marked by the addition of the ideograph *eme-sal* as belonging to a special dialect, does not agree at all with the facts of the case; for words with *m* for Akkad. *b* and the addition *eme-sal* never occur together in the Vocabularies. The right explanation of this curious technical term was first given by myself in note 3 of my lecture, "Der keilinschriftliche Sinfthbericht," p. 22, Leipzig, 1881. [Cf. also my "Akkadische Sprache," pp. xxiv and xxix.]

¹See especially the Munich "Ausland," the "Correspondenzblatt" of the German Anthropological Society, the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung," the Vienna "Montags-Revue," the Wiesbaden "Rheinische Kurier," the Berlin "Gegenwart" and Spamer's *Conversationslexikon der Gegenwart*. Also in his *Säugethiernamen* and *Jagdgeschichten* (Leipzig, 1879) and his Assyrian *Geschichtstabellen* (Leipzig, 1880) he has treated of Assyriological subjects in a very interesting manner. The *Jagdinschriften* are specially interesting from the statement contained in the *Additions* that to his regret he could not make use of my *Familiengesetze*. As the publisher informs me, the manuscript of the *Jagdinschriften* went to the printer on July 9 and the pamphlet was only issued in the beginning of November. But my *Familiengesetze* reached the author of the *Jagdinschriften* as early as July 22.

²[That the new dialect was spoken in North Babylonia was conjectured by A. H. Sayce as early as 1877. In VK, whose chief discovery is claimed to be this "perception," this priority of Sayce has simply been ignored. There is not a single reference to it even in the additions, although the author had in the meantime read the remarks of his friend C. B. in the *Literarische Centralblatt* of April 28th, 1883, Col. 618. He that lives in a glass house ought not to throw stones.]

those who may be interested in the personal question to the preface to my essay "Die akkadische Sprache," Berlin, 1883.

Mr. Pinches has said in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, where he published the important New List of Early Babylonian Kings and presented his acute remarks upon the two ideographs *Kur-eme-ku* (or *gu*) and *Kur-eme-luḡa*:¹ "Dr. Haupt had from the first expressed it as his opinion that the ordinary Akkadian was the language of the north and the dialect that of the south, answering to Akkad and Sumer respectively." Then, to support my theory, he felicitously points out the fact that the names for Babylon, even in the dialectal texts, are *Ka-dingi(r)-ra-ki* and *Tin-tir-ki*, and not *Ka-dim-me-ir-ki* and *Ti-tir-ki* (or *Til-tir-ki*), which would be the dialectal forms.² Now our learned opponent announced in the *Academy* of May 20th, 1882, that the names of Babel, *Dintir* ("tree of life") and *Ka-dingi(r)-ra* ("gate of God"), are no evidence for peculiarities in the *eme-x* dialect—so he terms the Akkadian—because "life" in the *eme-x* texts is really *til*, not *tin*, and because the latter can as well be transcribed *Kadimirra*³ as *Kadingirra*.

To this Mr. Pinches replied, with his usual accuracy, in the *Academy* of July 22d, 1882, that while *til*, "life," does occur both in the Akkadian and in the Sumerian texts, the later form *tin* is to be met with only in the monuments of the Akkadian dialect; that *Dintir* means not "Tree of Life" but "Seat of Life," Assyrian *šubat balāṭi*,⁴ and finally that *Ka-dingira* could never be read *Ka-dimirra*, since the Sumerian *dimmer*, "God," nowhere appears with the vowel of prolongation *a*.

These remarks of Mr. Pinches I can do nothing but confirm throughout; for *til*, "life," occurs in six passages of the Sumerian texts⁵ and in the Akkadian in twenty-one,⁶ the weakened form *ti*

¹ Already in 1868 M. Oppert had copied correctly *Kur-eme-luḡ-ga* instead of *Kur-eme-ga-ga*, and translated it rightly by "La pays de la langue des esclaves." [Cf. VK 252 and 260, also 477.]

² *Proceedings*, 1880-81, p. 44. I had communicated to Mr. Pinches a short time before that *tin* was the true Akkadian form.

³ [The wrong reading *Ka-dimirra* is also retained, VK 238; 464, 122; 473, 163; 508, l. 6, etc. Cf. especially VK 475.]

⁴ Cf. also *Transactions*, VII 105; [Akkadische Sprache, p. xxxi; VK 464, 122 and 466, 136.]

⁵ Cf. IV R. 9, 26a; 11, 5 and 11a; 18, 4 and 32b; ASKT. 123, 4.

⁶ II R. 39, 47c; 58, 51b; IV R. 12, 5; 13, 22a, 38 and 42b; 17, 3 and 4b; 28, 16a; 29, 29 and 31a, 5 and 11b; ASKT. 58, 70; 88, 38 and 42; 96, 6. 8 and 18; 98, 50; 104, 21.

in two Akkadian¹ and two Sumerian² passages. But the true Akkadian form *tin*, apart from No. 153 of the great Syllabary S^b, and the passage cited by Mr. Pinches in the Akkadian column of the Trilingual List of Gods (II R. 59, 31), occurs only in the undoubted Akkadian prayer, IV R. 19, No. 1, where the Assyrian *Beltu^m muballitāt miti*, "Beltis who makes quick the dead," answers to the Akkadian *Nen tin* BAD³ -*ga*. It also forms one of the elements of the Akkadian word for "wine," Assy. *karānu* or *kurānu*, Akkad. *gestin* (S^b 154; II R. 45, 58d; IV R. 27, 4b), which is not composed of *gi*⁴, "tree," and *tin*,⁴ "life," but, as Mr. Pinches rightly observes in the excellent "Sign-list" prefixed to his admirably edited "Texts in the Babylonian Wedge-writing,"⁵ from *gaš*, "drink," and *tin*, "life." *Gaš*, "drink,"⁶ in the compound *gaš* + *tin* becomes *geš* through the influence of the *i* in the following syllable, as *enigin*, "water-gathering, pool," stands for *a-nigin* and *e-gime*, "like water," for *a-gim-e*.⁷ The correctness of Mr. Pinches' explanation is put beyond all doubt by Obverse, l. 19 of the Akkadian Hymn to the God Adar,⁸ published in my *Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte*,⁹ where instead of the compound ideograph for "wine" we find the two signs *gaš* + *tin* separated.

A similar effect is produced by vowel-harmony acting in a contrary direction in the name *Din-tir* or *Tin-dir*. *Tir* stands here, as Mr. Pinches has already noticed, for *tur*, *dur*, which is

¹ S^b 108; ASKT. 98, 56.

² II R. 59, 31d; ASKT. 115, Obverse 7.

³ Mr. Pinches, *Sign-list*, No. 112, reads this ideograph *nisig*. This value, however, as there marked, is doubtful.

⁴ See Delitzsch, *Assyr. Lesestücke*, p. 30, No. 133; Lenormant, ESC. pp. 89-136.

⁵ Probably Mr. Pinches will next try to introduce the pretty word "Wedge-writing-token-gathering" instead of the un-Saxon "Syllabary."

⁶ The word *gaš* even when used separately is rendered by *kurānu*, "wine." Usually, however, its Assyrian equivalent is *šikāru*, *i. e.* Hebr. שִׁכָּר. Cf. II R. 27, 22a; 31, 68g; 46, 15e (read *ši-is-bi* in the line above); IV R. 26, 36b.

⁷ See Sayce, *Accadian Phonology*, London, 1877, p. 5; and my essay "Die akkadische Sprache," Berlin, 1883, p. 7, and additions to the same page on p. xxx. [Cf. now also VK 498, n. 251.]

⁸ I believe that *Adar* is not a compound of *a*, "father," and *tar*, "to conjure" (Schrader), but simply *dara* given as the Akkadian pronunciation of the ideograph EB in S^b 220, with the nominal prefix of derivation *a*. Already Lenormant read *Nin-dara* instead of *Nin-ēb*. [See now also VK 463, 119.]

⁹ I cite this work as ASKT.

shown to be the Akkadian pronunciation of the ideograph KU, "to dwell," Assy. *ašābu* by IV R. 14, 20a, etc. The change from *tur* to *tir* has been brought about again through the *i*-vowel of *tin*, "to live."

Equally incontestable is Mr. Pinches' objection that Sumerian *dimmer*, "God," never takes the lengthening *a*, and that therefore *Ka-dimmera* cannot be read instead of *Ka-dingira*. I have searched through all the Sumerian texts and have nowhere found *dim-me-ir-ra* or *dim-me-ra*.¹ The vowel of prolongation *a* is wanting with *dimmer* even before suffixes, while in Akkadian, as I have shown in my *Familiengesetze*, it appears regularly, and is then even lengthened into *ā*: "my God," Akkad. *dingirāmu* (written AN-*ra-a-mu*) is in Sumerian *dimmermu* (written *dim-mê-ir-mu*); "his God," Akkad. *dingirābi* (written AN-*ra-a-bi*), *dimmerbi* (*dim-me-ir-bi*).²

As to the hasty observations upon the important colophon of the tablet IV R. 46, to which Professor Delitzsch first called attention, they have been so well disposed of by Mr. Pinches³ that I need not pursue the matter further in this connection.

I now proceed to consider the main proof which our learned opponent brings forward in behalf of his assertions. "The surest way of finding out the region in which either of these dialects was spoken," the sagacious young scholar says in No. 524 of the *Academy* (May 20th, 1882), "is, of course, to trace the geographical names in the Sumero-Akkadian exorcisms and psalms."⁴ This sounds quite reasonable. I myself had the same idea in my mind from the first, and in 1880 I spoke about it to Mr. Pinches in the British Museum and Professor Eberhard Schrader in Berlin. With regard to this "Städtebeweis," however, I must confess that I am now a little distrustful of it, because we possess so far only a very small portion of the pre-Semitic Babylonian literature that has been buried under the ruins of Mesopotamia. As yet only twenty not very lengthy Sumerian texts have been published in

¹ Cf. *e. g.* II R. 59, 1a; IV R. 9, 38 and 50a, 11b; 10, 3a; 18, 12 and 30b; 26, 30a; 28, 3 and 19b; 30, 22a, 1 and 5b; 60, 28a and 27b; ASKT. 115, 13, Rev. 1; 116, 5 and 11; 125, 11; 127, 45; 180, II; 182, XIV; Sm. 954, Rev. 25.

² See, for example, IV R. 10, 10 and 32a; 21, 40b; ASKT. 117, 9; 121, Rev. 3; 123, 7; 125, 18; 180, I. [Cf. for the last passage VK 481.]

³ *Academy* of July 22d, 1882, p. 68. [Cf. now VK 475-477.]

⁴ [Compare for this VK 292-299.]

the IVth volume of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions*,¹ to which must be added the Hymn to the Goddess Istar, Sm. 954 in Professor Delitzsch's *Assyrische Lesestücke*, and the seven new Prayers and Penitential Psalms, first brought out by me in Part III of my *Keilschrifttexte*, and a few unpublished texts which I copied in the British Museum in April, 1882; for example, the Sumerian Hymn K. 4629, in the third column of which the Lady of *Nineveh* is mentioned, the unilingual Sumerian Litany K. 3898, and the fragments Sm. 526, K. 2871, R^m 2. 211, etc. This material is quite insufficient for such an investigation, especially as it does not contain a single *historical* text except IV R. 20, No. 1 [cf. VK 324], to which IV R. 12 forms an Akkadian pendant. These two, however, prove nothing, for in both of them Babylon is mentioned as *Suanaki*, "the powerful city," and *Ka-dingira-(kr)*, "the Gate of God."

But even granting that the conclusions based on this slight foundation were valid, no reasonable man would think of maintaining that the mere occurrence of the names of Upper Babylonian localities in the texts of the "Woman's Language" proves the Upper Babylonian origin of these inscriptions. If, for example, an ancient Lower Babylonian King had said on a monument: "I purposed to march to Akkad and to subjugate Nippur, Borsippa, Babylon, Kutha, Sippar and the other cities of Upper Babylonia, but the great Gods commanded me to abandon the expedition, which I intended to describe in the holy language of Sumer, although Istar communicated to me in a dream that two acute Frenchmen would come in later days to deny the existence of our idiom" — I scarcely think that general acceptance would be accorded to the brilliant theory that from the bare mention of the

These are IV R. 9; 10; 11; 18, No. 2; 19, No. 3; 20, No. 1; 21, No. 2; 23, No. 1; 24, No. 2 and 3; 26, No. 1. 2. 3 and 4; 27, No. 4; 28, No. 2; 29, No. 5; 30, No. 1 and 2, and lastly IV R. 60. Already in 1880 I pronounced fourteen of these texts to be dialectical, while the rest I declared unambiguously to be Sumerian in Part IV of my *Keilschrifttexte*. Cf. e. g. ASKT. pp. 134, 180, 183, 187, 191, 208, etc., etc. It is from these notices that the *supplementary list* in the *Academy* of May 20th, 1882, has been compiled. The three which are not borrowed from me, IV R. 20, No. 3; 26, No. 8 and 28, No. 4, cannot be proved to be Sumerian, and the only Sumerian text in IV R. whose dialectical character I had not yet publicly indicated, the highly important, unilingual tablet IV R. 60, is also wanting in this "supplementary list." [See now VK 470, 154 and 510, 470.]

names of these cities,¹ it follows as a matter of course that the author of such a text must have been an Akkadian. I must abide by my opinion that the *connection* in which the geographical names occur is of some little consequence. I have collected all the passages in which the names of cities, rivers and mountains are found in the Akkadian and Sumerian texts,² and if they are but looked at attentively in the light of the context, the castle of cards erected by the "father of Bavarian Assyriology"

¹ The ideographs representing these, of course, are intelligible even to dilettantis, though everything else were to them a book with seven seals.

² In the *Sumerian* texts the following geographical names are to be met with: *Ninaa*, "Nineveh," K. 4629, col. III. *Sippar*, "Sepharvaim," IV R. 11, 6a. *Tintira*, "Babylon," IV R. 11, 8a and b; 18, 10, 26 and 28b; 21, 51b; Sm. 954, Rev. 23; ASKT. 117, 15; 120, 1; 122, No. 18, 9; 182, 17. *Badsiaba*, "Borsippa," IV R. 11, 10a and b; ASKT. 180, VII. *Gudua*, "Kutha," IV R. 26, 6a. *Harsagkalama*, "Gharsagkalama," ASKT. 120, 31; Sm. 954, Rev. 21. *Nippur*, "Niffer," II R. 59, 9a; IV R. 11, 4a; 21, 47b; 27, 62a. *Unug*, "Erech," IV R. 19, 46b; ASKT. 120, 29. KI-UNU(MURUB)-KI-ga, Sm. 954, Rev. 19. ZA-SUGH-UNU(MURUB)-KI-ga, ASKT. 120, 30. KI-ZA-SUGH-UNU(MURUB)-KI-ga, Sm. 954, Rev. 20. *Kul-unu* (Zirlaba), "Kalneh" (?), ASKT. 120, 28. *Uru(m)*, "Ur," IV R. 9a and 23b. *Erizeva*, "Eridu," IV R. 21, 49b; ASKT. 117, 13; 122, No. 18, 7. *Nitukki*, "Dilmun," IV R. 60, 22b; 23, 24 and 38d; ASKT. 127, 37. *Buranunu*, "Euphrates," IV R. 26, 52a; ASKT. 118, Rev. 3. *A-aba*, "Sea," IV R. 9, 28a; 20, 21; 26, 23 and 48a; 30, 15a. *Abzu*, "Ocean," IV R. 60, 10b and 2c.

In the *Akkadian* texts occur: *Sippar*, "Sepharvaim," ASKT. 59, 16. *Tintira*, "Babylon," II R. 59, 47b and 17e [IV R. 20, No. 3, 12; 28, 29 and 50b]; 29, 21a. *Kadingira*, "Babylon," IV R. 12, 13; 18, 3a (?); ASKT. 59, 15. [*Badsiaba*, "Borsippa," IV R. 20, No. 3, 1 and 10.] *Nippur*, "Niffer," II R. 19, 54a; 59, 9b; [IV R. 28, 49b]; ASKT. 59, 14; unpublished Akkadian Hymn, R^m 126. [*Nisina* (Karrak?), IV R. 28, 31 and 51b.] *Uruduga*, "Eridu," see p. 79, note 1 and 2. *Buranunu*, "Euphrates," IV R. 1, 59b; ASKT. 77, 4; 98, 35. *Idigna*, "Tigris," IV R. 1, 59b; ASKT. 98, 35. *A-aba*, "Sea," II R. 19, 15b; IV R. 1, 59b; 3, 37b; ASKT. 82, 3. *Abzu*, "Ocean," II R. 19, 38a; 58, 44, 46 and 49b; IV R. 1, 53b; 3, 25b; 15, 54b; 18, 4 and 9a; 19, 1a; 21, 49a; 27, 15a; 29, 33a and 53c. *Gur*, "Ocean," IV R. 1, 36b; 15, 5b; ASKT. 76, 11, 15 and 21.

Concerning *Erech* we are told, in the *Academy* of May 20th, 1882, "It must be noted that *Erech* lies really in Accad or North Babylonia—as Professor Delitzsch has shown in *Wo lag das Paradies?* pp. 134 and 200—in spite of the neighborhood of *Ur* and *Eridu*." [Cf. VK 262.] Professor Delitzsch has by no means "shown" this; he only referred to III R. 38, Obv. 12 ff., a passage from which it does not at all follow that *Erech* was an Upper Babylonian city. But even admitting that the Assyrians really reckoned *Erech* as belonging to Akkad, we are not obliged to conclude that its inhabitants did not speak Sumerian. Do linguistic and political limits always coincide to a hair's-breadth?

falls to the ground at one stroke. For example, we find in a Sumerian text (IV R. 26, No. 1) the city *Gudua* referred to. This is Kutha, Hebr. כּוּתָּה, now represented, as Sir Henry Rawlinson and the late George Smith conjectured and Mr. Hormuzd Rassam subsequently proved beyond a doubt, by the ruins of *Tell Ibrâhm* not far to the east of Babylon. Kutha was an Upper Babylonian city; consequently, our sagacious opponent says, the "Woman's Language" the dialect of Akkad! This text, however, is a hymn to *Nergal*, the god of the planet Mars, the warrior among the gods and lord of the sepulchral world. When he is called here *Un-Gudua*, "Lord of Kutha," this only confirms the familiar statement from II Kings 17, 30 that Kutha was the centre of the Nergal-cultus.¹

Each of the cities of Babylonia had its own local deity. Bel was lord of Nippur (the present Niffer), Merodach lord of Babylon, Nebo lord of Borsippa, the sun-god *Samaš* lord of Sippar (Abu Habba), the moon-god Sin, lord of Ur (אֱוִיר בְּשָׁרִים, Mugheir, or rather Mugayyar), the sea-god Ea or Ae² lord of Eridu (Abu Shahrein). Accordingly, when at the end of a litany in the "Woman's Language," Bel of Nippur, Merodach of Babylon and other local deities of Upper Babylonian cities are invoked, this proves as little for the place where the text in question was composed as does the mention of Apollo of Delos³ in a Greek poem. I am really amazed that the usually so acute young scholar has not made this simple fact clear to himself. His misguided zeal must have made him quite blind. So he refers to the names of the mountains *Magan* and *Sābu*,⁴ which occur in two passages in the Akkadian texts, but has at the same time quite overlooked the fact that in a Sumerian hymn to the goddess Istar (ASKT 127, 37) the mountain of *Dilmun* is mentioned.⁵ It will hardly be maintained

¹ Cf. also II R. 60, 12a-11b. [Compare for this text Professor Delitzsch's remarks on p. ix of his *Paradies*]; 61, No. 5, 53; *Paradies*, p. 218; [VK 237 and 463-4, note 121].

² Delitzsch in Mürdter's *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, Stuttgart, 1882, p. 276. [Cf. VK 373, note.]

³ [Even in Greek inscriptions we find 'Απόλλων Δήλιος in Attica (CIG 381), and in Argos (CIG 1152), 'Α. Κλάριος in Attica (CIG 465), the Ephesian Artemis at Smyrna (CIG 5945), 'Ηρα 'Αργεία in Italy (CIG 5984 G).—B. L. G.]

⁴ [Cf. VK 474, 165; 236, note * *; 297, etc.]

⁵ Cf. also IV R. 60, 22b, 23, 24 and 38c. This island *Dilmun* or *Tilvum*, as M. Jules Oppert with genial insight perceived and announced for the first time before the Society of Biblical Archaeology, in the meeting of November 4,

that the island of *Dilmun*, thirty double leagues from the coast in the bosom of the Persian Gulf, lay in North Babylonia.¹

It is asserted further that the word for "ocean, depth of the sea," *abzu*, does not occur in the thirty texts written in the "Woman's Language," and that therefore this dialect cannot have been the dialect of Lower Babylonia which borders upon the sea. I am at a loss to know for whom this has been written. Every Assyriologist is aware that the sea (Sumer. *a-aba*, Assy. *tāmtu* or rather *tāmdu*, *i. e.* Hebr. *tēhōm*) is mentioned in the texts of the "Woman's Language," for example, IV R. 9, 28a; 20, 21; 26, 23 and 48a; 30, 15a, while this very expression *abzu*, the *Ἀπασάν* of Damascius, actually occurs twice in the unilingual Sumerian texts, IV R. 60, 10b; 2c.² Perhaps it would not be quite superfluous to study the Sumero-Akkadian texts a little more, before one comes forward to attack the theories of other (or rather of the) cuneiformists.

If our learned opponent had not lost sight of this indispensable fact, it would have been also clear to him why in the Akkadian incantations "Eridu (besides Ur, the most important capital of South Babylonia) is mentioned on almost every page." He might have learned even from Professor Delitzsch's *Paradies*, p. 228, that this city was the centre of the worship of Ea, the "God of the House of the Waters," the King of the ocean,³

1879, was the *Tílos* of the ancients, mentioned by Theophrastus, Arrian and Ptolemy, but more particularly by Pliny; the modern *Samak-Bahrein* on the Arabian coast of the Persian Gulf. The eminent French cuneiformist regards this island as having been the primitive seat of the Assyrians and Phoenicians. I would rather say "of the Sumerians and the Phoenicians." It has been my firm conviction for the last six years that the Phoenicians were originally Sumerian colonists. On M. Oppert's important discovery, compare also the observations of M. Ernest Renan in the *Journal Asiatique*, Tome 16, p. 62. [About the Phoenicians I have somewhat modified my views now. I shall treat of this interesting question shortly in a special article *Κοσσαιῶν*, *Ἰκσῶς*, *Φοίνικες*, *Ἀραβες*.]

¹ [See now VK 507, additions to p. 292.]

² It will be probably said that these texts of the "Woman's Language" belong to a very early time when the Persian Gulf extended as far north as Upper Babylonia! Some people know, in fact, as we gather from the article in the *Academy* of May 20, 1882, at what time all of the Sumero-Akkadian texts were composed, though they do not understand their contents and, as they themselves confess, have never seen a tablet in the original. [Cf. VK 378, 385, 408, etc., and for *abzu* VK 474, 166.]

³ Assy. *šar apst*, Akkad. *lugal abzuákid*, Sumer. *avzuav*. Cf. IV R. 55, 6b; 59, 33b; 63, 9b; III R. 12, Slab 2, l. 33. The last passage first made me think that the new dialect was the idiom of South Babylonia.

to whom Sennacherib offered sacrifices and threw into the sea a golden ship, a golden fish and a golden *aluttu*,¹ when on his sixth expedition he came to the shore of the Persian Gulf, with ships of the land of Chatti and Tyrian, Sidonian and Cyprian sailors, in order to cross over to the Elamitic city *Nagtu*. He is lord of the atoning flood, in which Nimrod, after his long wanderings, bathes, at "the mouth of the rivers,"² by command of his immortal ancestor Xisuthrus, and is thus at once freed from his sickness with which the curse of the offended Istar and her mother Anatu had smitten him. He is the good god, the protector of the pious, who announced to the god-fearing Xisuthrus in a dream the coming of the flood and commanded him to build a ship. He alone, by virtue of his unfathomable wisdom, possesses the power to break the magic spell of evil demons and their ministers. Through his exorcisms he compelled the dreadful *Ninkigal*, the queen of the underworld, to release the goddess Istar and let her ascend again to the world of light. The god Bel in his distress turned to him when the seven Evil Spirits had stormed heaven, overpowered the sun-god Šamas, the moon-god Sin and the air-god Rimmon, and banished Anu, the god of heaven, with his daughter Istar from the celestial world. To his secret realm in the unfathomable depth of the ocean his ever-helpful son Merodach descends whenever he sees a pious man subjected to the curse of the evil demons, in order to beg from his all-knowing and all-wise father the means of breaking the evil spell and healing the tormented man. "What shall he do, this man?" says the god, "I know not whereby he may recover." Then answers Ea his son Merodach: "My son, what dost thou not know? what shall I say to thee more? Merodach, what dost thou not know? how shall I

¹ This is perhaps "helm, rudder." [Seems to me very doubtful now.]

² The mouth of the Euphrates and Tigris, to whose waters at this spot was ascribed special healing virtue, as Professor Delitzsch remarks in his *Paradies*, p. 174. Accordingly, Ea also says in the Incantation, IV R. 22, 10b, to Merodach, who comes to him with the entreaty that he would heal a man who was possessed: "Go, my son! lead him to the *mouth of the rivers* and sprinkle him then with the water, over which thou shalt have spoken words of purification." This expression happens to occur only in this single passage. In some people's eyes this also is a proof that this Akkadian Incantation was composed in the region adjacent to the Persian Gulf, and that the Akkadian therefore cannot have been the language of Upper Babylonia! [Cf. VK 296, and for IV R. 22, 13b the excellent *Nouvelles notes de lexicographie assyrienne* par M. Stanislas Guyard in the *Journal Asiatique*, Août-Septembre 1883, p. 196, § 16.]

help thee further? What I know that knowest thou also. Go, my son Merodach, sprinkle him with the purifying sprinkling of Eridu, release him from the curse, free him from the curse." This, with some modifications, is repeated in almost every exorcism. In every passage of the Akkadian magical formulae where Eridu is mentioned there is a reference to the atoning sprinkling of Eridu,¹ or else Merodach, the helpful son of the good god Ea, is invoked as *tur Urudugákid*,² "son of Eridu." How any one can imagine this an irrefragable proof that all these texts were composed in the neighborhood of Eridu, and therefore written in the dialect of Lower Babylonia, I fail to see.

I think I may now spare myself the labor of further refutation, and for the rest, refer to Mr. Pinches' article in the *Academy* of July 22d, 1882.

In his article in *Das Ausland*, 1882, p. 445, the Munich scholar says: "My whole argument might have been completed with much fewer words, if Haupt, and through his influence Delitzsch and Pinches, immediately after the discovery of the new dialect,³ had not hastily and on a very superficial examination identified the *eme-sal* dialect with the Lower Babylonian or Sumerian, which prematurely announced result had almost threatened to become the common property of Assyriologists. Paul Haupt has even made this the foundation of the division of his work 'Akkadische und Sumerische (it should be Sumerische und Akkadische) Keilschrifttexte,' and is now obliged to correct the two expressions through almost 300 large quarto pages."⁴ Dreadful! very dread-

¹Akkad. *nam-šub* (or *nam-šib*) *Urudugá-kid*, Assy. *šipat Eridi*. See, for example, ASKT. 104, 11. 12; IV R. 3, 8b; 4, 29a; 5, 62c [*šicf*]; 6, 36c; 15, 12. 43. 45b (cf. also 53 and 57b); 16, 33b; 27, 53 and 62b; 30, 46b.

²Assyr. *már Eridi*. See ASKT. 90, col. III, 2; 105, 31; II R. 58, 39 and 52b; IV R. 3, 41b; 4, 23b; 8, 40b; 15, 62a; 28, 56a; 30, 40b. [Cf. VK 473, 164.]

³Here the discovery of the new dialect is again ascribed to me. [Cf. VK 286.]

⁴This amusing *Hersenserguss* is, grammatical errors and all, given unchanged: "Unsere ganze Beweisführung hätte mit viel wenigeren Worten abgemacht werden können, wenn nicht gleich von Anfang an nach der Entdeckung des neuen Dialektes Haupt, und von ihm veranlasst Pinches und Delitzsch, vorschnell und auf oberflächliche Prüfung hin, den *eme-sal*-Dialekt mit dem südbabylonischen oder sumerischen identifiziert hätten, welch voreilig aufgestelltes Resultat fast schon drohte, Gemeingut der Assyriologie zu werden. Paul Haupt hat sogar dasselbe als Einteilung seinem Werke 'Akkadische und sumerische (soll heißen: sumerische und akkadische) Keilschrifttexte' zu Grunde gelegt und ist nun gezwungen, durch fast 300 Quartseiten hindurch überall die betreffenden zwei Ausdrücke umzukorrigieren."

ful! I am not sure how one would propose to carry out practically this "correcting." Am I to have all the copies of my work cancelled and have a new edition prepared with Munich terminology? That would perhaps be somewhat premature if not too late. We will in the meantime let things remain as they are, and still as before regard as the dialect of Lower Babylonia, to the first observation of whose peculiarities I was led, as I must once more remark, by an American lady, the Babylonian Woman's Language.
PAUL HAUPT.

POSTSCRIPT.—The above was written by me in the summer of 1882, before I had begun the composition of the introduction to my *Akkadische Sprache*, and in the beginning of October of the same year it was sent to Professor A. H. Sayce in Oxford. The letter in which my learned friend acknowledged the receipt of the manuscript is dated Oct. 27, 1882. After this the article remained in the hands of the Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archaeology in London until the beginning of February 1883, if I remember correctly. Who else besides these two gentlemen has informed himself of the contents of the manuscript, I am at a loss to tell.

I have published it above without alterations; only I have not considered it worth while to mention the name of my opponent. For a periodical of the character of the *American Journal of Philology*, the person in question, to use a phrase of Paul de Lagarde's,¹ comes into consideration only as a type. In the meantime a bulky volume has been printed, in which also Assyriological subjects are treated by him. Some portions of it had already appeared in periodicals. It is entitled *Die semitischen Völker und Sprachen*, and is published by Herr Otto Schulze, 11 Querstrasse, Leipzig. The first part, which the well-known author of that excellent treatise *Wesen und Ursprung des Status constructus im Hebräischen* (Weimar, 1871), Professor Friedrich Philippi, designated as "essentially a compilation from Renan, Grau, Kremer and Krehl (Brockhaus' Conversations Lexicon) and others," came out in the summer of 1881, dedicated by the author to "his Apollonia." The second part, which bears the pompous title *Die vorsemitischen Kulturen in Aegypten und Babylonien* (Pre-semitic Civilisation in Egypt and Babylonia), was received by me on Christmas, 1882, and the notes, additions,

¹ *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1883, Stück 9 and 10, p. 291.

corrections and index belonging to it reached me on the 20th of November 1883. We cite the book under the letters VK.

In general we can say that the book as a whole confirms the judgment expressed on p. xviii of our *Akkadische Sprache*. It shows the great ability, the untiring industry and wide reading of the author, but it is to be regretted that this publication also is hurried and not sufficiently matured. Hence the carelessness and negligence of expression,¹ the want of unity in disposition and execution of the material, the constant retractions and modifications of his former statements not seldom expressed in the same book. Nor are these faults covered up by his assurance in charging Delitzsch, Pinches and myself with prematureness and superficiality (see above p. 79, n. 4). But wherefore, pray, this restless haste? Assyriology certainly will not run away, and the *weitere Leserkreis* (VK 440, n. 1) of *gebildete Laien* (VK 325), we should think, could easily continue a few years longer without a full knowledge of pre-Semitic civilisation in Egypt and Babylonia. Concentration and penetration of study are necessary above all things. Industrious hack-writing and calumnious reviews will scarcely advance cuneiform research.

I saw with pleasure the remarks on the names of the Demons *Gal(l)a* and *Mul(l)a*, VK 367, n. 1; the combination of *utul* and *etil*, VK 275; 460, 170 and 489; as also the explanation of the *r* in the incorporated pronoun of the second person, VK 514, additions to p. 497, n. 249. These are all neat and suggestive observations,² infinitely more profitable to science than chronological and *kulturhistorische* phantasies. Very sensible, moreover, is the statement, VK 301, that in the official royal inscriptions we cannot expect to find any dialectical forms, but his proof for this is inadmissible. Neither does it prove anything that the Gudea Inscriptions of Tell Loh are apparently not written in the *eme sal* dialect (VK 223 note, and VK 302).³ The foot-note VK 233 is perfectly enigmatical to me. Sometimes I can scarcely avoid the

¹ Compare, for instance, "*das ofte (!) Vorkommen*," VK 377, which I pointed out already in ZDMG 1880, p. 759, n. 2.

² Very hazardous, on the other hand, is the repetition of the Sumerian *shu-bu*, "his hand," on the authority of others without critical examination (VK 276, l. 4). This interesting form namely rests only on IV R. 10, 37b and ASKT 115, 15! Compare for this IV R. 10, 58a and my *Akkadische Sprache*, p. 25.

³ Cf. our remarks in the Johns Hopkins University Circular for March 1884, p. 51.

impression that this observation was communicated to the author from London. But of course this is impossible, for in that case my learned opponent would have mentioned it, just as he repeatedly acknowledges that his attention was first called to the dialectical character of the highly important unilingual text IV R. 60 by the introduction to my *Akkadische Sprache*.¹ Only I cannot understand how the author did not realize that with the establishment of this fact the argumentative value of the geographical names is destroyed.

I beg leave now to make a few additions to the above article. They were written on the 16th of April after the essay had been set in type. Wherever it was possible without inconvenience I have inserted the references to the corresponding parts of the *Vorsemitische Kulturen* in the proof in brackets [].²

I. Ad. p. 69, n. 2. Lenormant (*Magie*, p. 399) ought to have quoted Sayce and Delitzsch. The observations of Pinches and Lenormant that bear on the matter have been cited by me ASKT 147. It may be said here that the bibliographical statements were inserted at that point only to fill out the vacant space at the close of the first section. A discussion of the question of priority I reserved for the preface of my *Keilschrifttexte*. Unfortunately, the last part of the book could not be brought out so soon as I hoped at the time when I wrote the fourth. I am still waiting for the second part of VR. On Aug. 17, 1882, Sir Henry Rawlinson wrote me that "any waste sheets or corrected proofs that were not required by Mr. Pinches should be placed at my disposal." It was thought better, however, to hand them to Dr. Carl Bezold.

II. Ad. p. 70, n. 1. In these remarks on the *Jagdinschriften* I have in mind cases such as p. 5, n. 1 of the above-mentioned book: *mu'addû* for **muyaddû*. If the author had found out for himself that ידע has a *ṛ originarium* (SFG 22, 1), he would certainly have regaled us with a special note on this "wirkliche, ihm angehörende Entdeckung."³ It was evidently not before the correction of the

¹ See p. xxxi of the introduction, l. 4 from the bottom, and VK 470, n. 154, etc.

² In the foot-note 2 of p. 75 the references from IV R. 20, No. 3 and 28 are enclosed in brackets because by some these texts are considered dialectical. To me, however, this view does not seem to be sufficiently well founded; the divine name *Mu-ṣi-eb-ba-sa-a* (*Muzevasa*), IV R. 20, No. 3, l. 6 (cf. IV R. 21, 53b and VK 473, 163), the prefix *am*, IV R. 28, 34b (cf. IV R. 26, 54b), and the *mubar(r)a* in l. 54 of the same text, do not prove much.

³ Cf. VK. 471; 158, additions to p. 289 and *ibidem* p. 495, note*.

proof that *muyaddi'u* was inserted, as well as the observation on the phonetic value *kus* of the character *su* (p. 40), which I established SFG 61.

III. Ad. p. 75, n. 2. Meanwhile the very careful young Munich Assyriologist, Dr. Carl Bezold, has published the results of his researches on this question in No. 18 of the *Literarische Centralblatt* of April 28th, 1883, Col. 618. I have thought it profitable to reproduce his list in this place, and should like to make use of this opportunity to call attention to the charming little lecture of the same scholar on Cuneiform Inscriptions which recently appeared in the collection of popular scientific lectures, edited by Rud. Virchow and Fr. von Holtzendorff. By the attractive representation and sober judgment it is peculiarly adapted to convey to the non-Assyriologist an idea both of the extraordinary difficulties and of the epoch-making results of cuneiform research.

According to Dr. Bezold the passages of the Sumero-Akkadian literature furnish the following: "A. South Babylonia (Sumer): 1. *Eridu* is found only in texts of the principal dialect (12 times, also in a bilingual inscription V R. part II, col. III, 46; the locality *Eri-ziba* in four passages of the *eme-sal* texts has hitherto not been identified, the author [of VK] is inclined to Borsippa); 2. *Makan* is found in a text of the principal dialect IV R. 13, perhaps also in the unpublished fragment K. 3173, Obv. 6, belonging to IV R. 25; 3. *Dilmun*, not noticed by the author [of VK], is found in the principal dialect, IV R. 25 (which text the author of VK regards as comparatively late, VK 306; 313). On the other hand we find in *eme-sal* texts in B. North Babylonia (Akkad) the cities: 1. *Erech* in three places, also K. 4629, Col. III, 14; *Nisin*, IV R. 28 (cf. VK 207); 3. *Nippur* in 2 places, also K. 5157, Obv. 19; 4. *Kalneh*, D. T. 67; 5. *Kutha*, IV R. 26; 6. *Borsippa* in two passages, also 81, 2-4, 207, Obv. 35; 7. *Babylon* in 14 passages; 8. *Sippar* in 3 passages. In this enumeration the three fragments IV R. 20, No. 3; 26, No. 8, and 28, No. 4 have been counted as *eme-sal* texts, as the author has pointed out in the *Academy* 1882, 362. All the other passages of the bilingual cuneiform inscriptions, in which geographical names are to be met with, must either be differently explained or remain as yet entirely enigmatical, namely: IV R. 12, 13; 23, 3a; 29, 21a (cf. VK 297); II R. 19, 54a and IV R. 9, 9a; 23b; for the latter the author's [?] probable explanation (VK 233, foot-note and often) is to be compared."

In this collection of Dr. Bezold the references to the unpublished texts K. 3173, K. 5157 and K. 4629 are especially important; also a passage overlooked by me, IV R. 25, 18a, where *Nitukki* "Dilmun" seems to occur. But I cannot understand at all why it should be doubted that *Eri-zeva* is the same as *Eridu* or *Uru-duga*. Compare my *Akkadische Sprache*, p. 37, and Professor Delitzsch's *Paradies*, p. 228.

P. H.

NOTES.

ON AN INSCRIPTION OF DODONA.¹

When Carapanos published the results of his excavations on the site of Dodona, he was of the opinion that, besides the numerous questions addressed to the oracle, he had also deciphered some half a dozen answers of the oracle itself from the leaden plates upon which they were both inscribed. The scholars who have since treated the subject have either disputed this conclusion altogether, or have deemed it possible rather than probable. In fact, the supposed answers are so fragmentary and so dubious as to court scepticism at once, as Carapanos now acknowledges; but he has succeeded recently in deciphering another plate which offers a reasonable ground for believing that at last an answer has been found. The question upon one side of the plate reads as follows:

θεό[ς], τύ[χα] ἀγα | θά· ἐρ[ωτ]εῖ Ἀντίο | χο[ς τὸ]ν Διὶ καὶ
τὰν | Διὶ [α]ν ὑπὲρ ὑγι | εἰας [α]ὐτοῦ καὶ πα | τρὸς καὶ
ἀδελφ | ἄς τ[ί]να θεῶν | ἡ ἡρ[ώ]ων τιμᾶν | τι λ[ώ]ιον καὶ
ᾶ | μείνον εἴη.

This is plain enough, and accords with the questions previously published. On the back of the same plate he finds the following:

ΕΙΣΕΡΜΙ
ΟΝΑ
ΟΡΜΑ
ΣΑ
ΑΝΤΙ

¹ The emendations in this note had been jotted down and its plan sketched out for some time, waiting leisure to be put into shape, when the Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift for Feb. 2d was received, containing an article by Th. Gomperz on the same subject, suggesting the same change of reading (ὀρμάσαντι), and alluding to Demeter Thermasia, but not touching other points. Such independent conjectures carry weight if they do not convince.—A. C. M.

Upon this he remarks, in the *Revue Archéologique*, Dec. 1883, p. 356:—Ce qui veut dire, traduit mot à mot, et en prenant le mot *ὀρμᾶσα* comme une forme de participe féminin, forme dorique, au lieu de *ὀρμῶσα*, signifierait: "A Hermione, à celle qui s'élance vis-a-vis." C'est une vraie réponse d'oracle, parce que, tout en étant claire, elle peut avoir un double sens; elle peut signifier: à Hermione même, à celle qui s'élançant de l'île d'Hydréa située en face et séparée par un étroit passage de mer; et elle peut aussi signifier: vis-a-vis d'Hermione, c'est-à-dire à Hydréa.

This explanation seems forced and unnatural; but the Greek can be made intelligible by a slight emendation, which may be the more readily offered, as the grammatical construction demands some change. To satisfy the meaning assigned by Carapanos we should read *εἰς Ἑρμιόνα[ν] ὀρμᾶσα[ν] ἀντί*, if the heroine is intended; but for the town, *εἰς Ἑρμιόνα ὀρμᾶσα[ν] ἀντί* will suffice. Instead of this, however, still assuming his construction of *ἀντί*, we may write *εἰς Ἑρμιόνα ὀρμᾶσα[ι] ἀντί*, "Hasten to Hermione opposite." One naturally thinks of the Argolic Hermione on the opposite side of Greece. Here was a famous temple of Demeter Thermasia (Paus. 2, 34, 11), whose appellative suggests warm curative springs, and there was another temple of the same goddess with the same epithet on the border between Hermione and Troezen (Paus. 2, 34, 6. Cf. Artemis Thermia at Thermae near Mytilene, Samml. Griech. Dial. Inscr. 257, 268, 259). The town also contained a shrine of Aesculapius, as may be inferred from the two inscriptions, C. I. G. 1198, 1222, and a sanctuary of Isis and Serapis, who was a god of healing, though this may be too late. Carapanos gives no epigraphic keys, except that *c* occurs in the question, *ς* in the answer; *ε* in both. At all events, here was enough of doubt to leave a loophole of safety for the oracle in case its advice failed, not to mention several other deities worshipped there. Whether advantage might have been taken of the current proverb, *ἀνθ' Ἑρμιῶνος* (Suidas), we will not venture to say; but there was still another alternative, since Demeter and Kore possessed the surname Hermione at Syracuse (Hesychius), on the opposite coast from Epirus. But as the use of *ἀντί* in this sense is doubtful, we have merely to suppose that A has been (with oracular craft?) repeated, and read *εἰς Ἑρμιόνα ὀρμᾶσαντι*, when there results as apt an answer to the question of Antiochus as could well be desired, so far as the language is concerned, with all the ambiguity retained.

A. C. MERRIAM.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF AEGEUS IN THE MEDEA OF
EURIPIDES.

In the prefatory remarks to his very scholarly and serviceable edition of the *Medea*, Professor Allen says: "With more justice," than with the sending of the dragon-chariot, "one might find fault with the introduction of Aegeus, whose appearance just at the nick of time is purely accidental and not brought about by anything in the action itself. In fact, this scene has little dramatic interest or import, and seems to be introduced mainly to bring on the stage an Athenian national hero" (p. 10).

I am inclined to take a more favorable view of the art of Euripides in this scene. The simplicity of the plot is relieved by the introduction of another character; that character is, as Professor Allen remarks, an Athenian national hero; he satisfies our anxiety or curiosity in regard to the future fate of Medea; and, what is the important point, the key-note of the play is emphasized by the contrast between his fate and that of Jason. Medea's exquisite revenge, a revenge to which she sacrifices her own maternal love, is to render Jason childless and without hope of children, though now a father and with a blooming wife. Her gratitude to Aegeus, on the other hand, who offers her a shelter from persecution, shows itself by the promise of fulfilling for him his desire of offspring, so long unsatisfied. Medea thus gives to her friend what she is going to take away from her foe; and Aegeus's solicitude for the blessing emphasizes in the hearer's mind the direfulness of the bereavement.

If the appearance of Aegeus is "purely accidental," it is still natural. It happens just as a thousand things happen in ordinary life. The scene has doubtless less dramatic interest than others in the play, yet it is not dull, nor below the proper level of the table-land whence rise such peaks of tragic grandeur.

THOMAS CHASE.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Ueber Herkunft und Sprache der transgangetischen Völker. Festrede . . . gehalten . . . 25 July, 1881, von ERNST KUHN. München, 1883. 4to, pp. 22.

This is an interesting paper, and worthy of attention for its relations both to its special theme and to certain points in the general study of language upon which it touches. The author introduces his subject by pointing out the natural *nexus* of interest which leads us on from the institutions of India to their extension over neighboring parts of the earth, and then to matters concerning the older history of the populations to whom they were communicated. A consideration of the geographical conditions of Further India shows him that the history of emigration in that peninsula is governed by the river-courses; and he assumes that the successive waves of population will have followed one another downward from the central uplands of the interior, each driving its predecessor to the lowest coast-line, or crowding it out of the fertile and desirable valleys into the bordering mountains. We find, then, in the Peguans, Cambodians, and Annamites the remains of prior settlements, expelled from their first seats by the intrusive Siamese and Burmese; and supporting indications are claimed to be discovered in the traditions of the various peoples, and the changes of location of their capitals. The southwestern parts of China, also, are occupied by tribes that appear to be plainly related with the Siamese and Burmese. North of Yun-nan, again, are the original seats of the Tibetans; and not far away, on the middle course of the Hoang-ho, is the theatre of the earliest Chinese history. It is the question, then, whether any linguistic signs of relationship are to be traced among the four peoples thus inferentially brought into geographic neighborhood.

Professor Kuhn here gives a sketch of the history of investigation among the transgangetic languages. A complete bibliography of the subject, prepared as an intended supplement to the present paper, he has decided to reserve for publication in another form. But he regards it as an unquestionable inference from the facts already made accessible, that the languages of southeastern Asia fall into two groups, corresponding with the division of the peoples stated above: namely, Annamite and Peguan and Cambodian on the one side, and the rest of the peninsular tongues, along with the Chinese and Tibetan, on the other. And the movements that have carried the Burmese and Siamese southward, and crowded the Tibetans westward, up the course of the higher Brahmaputra, behind the Himalayas, are, we are told, to be ascribed with probability to the growing extension of Chinese power. The northern group is divisible into an eastern and a western sub-group, Chinese-Siamese and Tibeto-Burman, the latter having on the whole the more primitive character. There are perplexing diversities in the way of more detailed classification; and to account for them, the author seems disposed to call in that *deum ex machina* of the classi-

fier in difficulties, the influence of neighboring tongues of a wholly different stock. Doubtless it would be better to let the problem simply pass as one yet unsolved.

The leading common characteristic of all these tongues is, as every one knows, their monosyllabism, and their lack of grammatical structure, the place of which is to a certain degree supplied by a fixed order of arrangement of the words composing a sentence. As regards lexical evidence, Professor Kuhn considers the common origin of the languages in each of the two chief groups above distinguished to be proved by the agreement of numerals within the group, and the diversity of the groups by their discordance with one another in the same respect. It must be confessed, however, that the comparative table of numerals in the northern group, given by him in a note, is very far from convincing; as, on the other hand, for reasons to which he himself alludes (and which are abundantly illustrated, for instance, in our Indian languages), discordant numerals need not be disproof of relationship. The laws of arrangement in the sentence are looser in the Tibeto-Burman sub-group, which also makes freer use of auxiliary particles; and the order followed is by no means the same in all the languages. But this difference, we are told, should not be regarded as having grown out of an original agreement, but rather out of a condition of greater freedom of arrangement; and this must be held to involve the former possession of a fuller grammatical apparatus. The suggestion is a very ingenious and significant one, and ought to be received with respectful attention, whether we are or are not ready at once to accept it. Our author proceeds to bring up facts from the various languages which may be regarded as giving it support. These are, in his opinion, manifold. The Chinese, in the first place, shows in some of its existing dialects and in its older phases remains of a greater fulness of phonetic form, especially having final consonants which the classical language has now lost. Similar facts are found in Siamese and Burman. But the most striking case is the Tibetan; the written forms of this language, dating from the seventh century, present numerous consonant combinations, now silent except in certain dialects, and indicating former possession by its words of more than the single syllable to which they are now restricted. In some cases, it is asserted, these affixes have an apparent grammatical character; and Professor Kuhn ventures to claim that in the other languages also are seen signs of fusion of a numeral particle with the proper numeral; but, as already stated, the comparative table he gives to show this is extremely unconvincing. He regards, however, the evidence he presents as absolutely demonstrating that the Chinese monosyllabism is no original one, but a result of phonetic decay. Such is well known to be the opinion of Lepsius, and of more than one other recent authority; and the indications must be confessed to point decidedly that way, although by no means so unmistakably as is here assumed.

So far, however, as regards the bearing of this new (asserted) aspect of the Chinese upon the question as to an original root-stage of language in general, the views of our author are open to criticism; and it is the more desirable to spend a few words upon the matter, inasmuch as there are others now-a-days who go even further than he in claiming that the root-theory breaks down hopelessly if the support of Chinese original monosyllabism is withdrawn from under it. No misapprehension could well be greater than this. A root,

in the first place, is not a phonetic element of a given extent; it is simply a significant element lacking any grammatical character, not admitting an analysis which demonstrates in it a formal part, marking it as a part of speech, a derivative from a more primitive word, or an inflectional form. A language composed only of such elements is a root-language, whatever be their length. Dissyllabism does not take away the radical character. There are languages enough to be found—for example, the ancient Egyptian and the modern Polynesian—of which the roots are in part or prevailing of more than one syllable. One may be strongly persuaded that the really ultimate roots of human speech were monosyllabic, and may devise theories to account for these longer radical entities, without yielding their radical nature. A combination, for example, of root with root makes only a root, unless one of the two enters, with a recognized and correspondent value, into a whole series of combinations, becoming thus a modifier to its fellow in each combination. The lost Chinese finals have yet to be shown to possess in this way a grammatical character, before they can be held to prove the Chinese not a language of roots. That the Chinese and its relatives "have run a long career of development, and grown worn with age, like the languages of Europe," is of course true. All existing languages, so far as we know, have behind them the same immense past, and a past of never-ending growth and change. Of this past, the period covered by the development of the Indo-European inflective system is probably only a small part; at any rate, he who imagines that in determining the Indo-European roots he has arrived at a point anywhere near the actual beginnings of human speech is immensely mistaken. But that the Chinese has never had a development even remotely like that of European tongues is sufficiently shown by its present condition, which is as unlike as possible to that of the monosyllabic part of English, wherein are lacking neither parts of speech nor derivatives nor inflections. If the Chinese, in growing out of a presumable original monosyllabism, acquired nothing in the way of structure of which it could retain the results when phonetically decayed, it is still a root-language, and almost or quite as good as ever for the use long made of it—namely, to show how a language destitute of grammatical structure can answer the needs even of a gifted and highly civilized people, and thus to take away all difficulty from the assumption that the first rude human beings made a language of roots serve their restricted purposes.

For the impregnable basis of the radicular theory, as has been repeatedly pointed out, is twofold. In the first place, its theoretic necessity; since anything devised and created by human beings, as part of their progress upward toward a state of culture, must have begun with what is simplest in its kind. To regard men as using from the start words made up of a radical part and a formative or grammatical part is precisely equivalent to regarding them as having begun to fight and to work with tools that had handles. He who does not see this has still to learn what language is and what has been its history. The other and completely correlative part of the basis is this: that, in the observable history of languages, we see abundant instances of the production of new formative elements, new signs of grammatical distinction; and that it is always and only by a reduction to formative or grammatical value of previously existing material elements of speech; whence a sound linguistic philosophy forces us to the inference that the same has been the case from the begin-

ning, and that the way to grammatical expression lies only through combination. With regard to this point, Professor Kuhn is in a very hopeful state, as appears from the concluding paragraphs of his paper. He ventures there to raise a word of protest against what he calls the "hitherto accepted philosophy of language." The latter, he says, is at a loss to find words of condemnation severe enough for languages guilty of mixing up material and form, by applying words of recognizably material content to those uses for which we provide by suffixes—as is to a great extent the case in the tongues of which he has been treating. He, on the contrary, is inclined to note their analogy with such elements in his own language as *-thum*, *-schaft*, *-heit*, *-bar*, all of them demonstrably material in origin. "Wherever," he adds, "we see suffixes come into being, they come in this way; and we may with some reason (*mit einigem Rechte*) infer that they have in general been thus originated." Here is a very encouraging bit of independence and good sense; and the author has only to go on boldly on the same track to escape altogether the shackles of the now prevalent philosophy of language in Germany, and to substitute for it the true scientific and historical method. That philosophy has really as little to do with the science of language as the Hegelian philosophy with geology or zoology. The former is all well in its way, but it does not stand upon the same plane with the other, and nothing but detriment and confusion can come of their mixture. The only justifiable scientific method, in the study of language as in every other branch of scientific inquiry, is to reason back from the known to the unknown. And the argument, as not long ago stated in the pages of this Journal (Vol. I, p. 337) runs thus: if in the historical periods of language we see formative elements made by the agglutination of independent material words, and do not see them made in any other way, and if the grammatical relations thus provided for are of the same kind, and not less difficult, than those expressed by the other formative elements whose history is beyond our ken, then it necessarily follows, not merely that we have "some reason" to regard the latter elements as having been made in the same way as the former, but that we have no reason to regard them as made in any other way. That is to say, this is the only, and the sufficient, method of explanation of the structural growth of language which the historical study of language has yet brought to light; any other, even concurrent one, must wait for admission until a historical basis has been found for it. Moreover, this kind of reduction of material elements to a formal value is only one division of the most pervading of all movements in the development of language. It is not easy to see why Professor Kuhn should have referred only to the suffixes of our European languages; their auxiliaries and form-words are a still closer parallel to the formative apparatus of less developed tongues, and involve processes of adaptation as gross and coarse as any that the latter can exhibit. Thus, to take the nearest example at hand, the German and English alike have a substantive verb, expressing the fundamental grammatical relation of predication, which is pieced together out of fragments of three verbs having the material senses of 'grow,' 'stay,' and 'sit' (or else 'breathe'): the Romanic tongues have patched in 'stand' instead of 'stay.' And to denote its temporal and modal relations, they employ various verbs traceable to the material senses of 'turn,' 'seize,' 'be big or strong,' 'select' (with a probable further background of 'surround'), 'be under penalty' (perhaps ultimately 'have committed a crime'),

and so on. Our phraseology, too, is crammed with examples of the same kind. What has the present accepted philosophy of language to say of such expressions, for example, as *es fällt mir ein* ('it falls in to me') or "it occurs to (*i. e.* 'runs against') me," for that extremely familiar but also transcendently mysterious act of framing a sudden conception? And is not all our intellectual and moral language made up of such grossly material elements? Of their grossness, the mind that uses them is totally unconscious, and the intellectual action that underlies them is alike in all those who employ their unending variety. To say *heap-man* instead of *men* or *Männer*, to us who have the latter forms, is of an amusing rudeness; so would be *I shall have been*, if employed with etymological understanding of its elements by one accustomed to say *fuero*; but to one whose habitual expression it has become, the sense of the grammatical relation, of plurality and so forth, is in either case just as pure and as integral as is that of the synthetic form to its user. Those who have to learn a tongue of ruder structure do not find the character of their mental apprehensions degraded by it; the process of thought is the same with either instrument. To get at the kernel of a nut, one may with nearly equal advantage avail himself of : rough stone, a polished hammer, or a patent nut-cracking machine; and while we may admire the superior ingenuity of the last, we do not fail to recognize in all alike the essentially human faculty of adapting means to ends, nor to acknowledge that the remote ancestors of those who now have machines possessed nothing better than stones; and we should especially laugh at any who maintained that the metal in their machines was never rude mineral that had to be dug out of the dirty ground. But this is what is virtually done by those who insist that in their languages the apparatus of formal expression has been always and only formal. In direct opposition to them, it is to be maintained that in no language does anything formal exist that was not first material; investigation, experience, and sound anthropologic theory all unite to show this; and there is nothing against it but prejudice and pride. Our views of the history of language, in order to be defensible and abiding, must be made to fit into our general anthropology, as a consistent part of it; for language is simply one of the various acquisitions by which man has become what he is. Now what can we suppose to have been the mental condition and capacity of men who have not yet possessed themselves of speech? Certainly not superior to that of the comparatively cultivated races in the more recent stages of their history, but rather the contrary; we cannot help believing that there has been a gradual advance in intellectual grasp and reach, partly as a consequence of the gradual elaboration of speech. It would be, then, of the utmost degree of strangeness if in primitive times a loftier and freer mode of language-making was within reach than we now find attainable by ourselves; if those items of formal expression which in the period over which our observations extend have had to be slowly wrought out and adapted to their purpose from the general material of speech, could be struck off out of hand by the earliest speech-makers. Yet we have this palpable absurdity involved in the language-theories of a variety of schools: of those who hold that certain languages are "form-languages" and others not; or that speech began with sentences, which gradually begat words by a fissiparous process; or that pronouns are the endings of verbs, which have dropped off and set up an independent existence; or that the founders of each race of men produced the various exist-

ing languages complete "at a single stroke"—and so on through the whole list of *a priori* systems, which are saved from general and utter condemnation only by the too prevalent substitution of empty speculations for the scientific method of induction from facts.

Our author's concluding opinion, that we are not to infer mental infirmity in the races possessing these peculiar and structurally impoverished tongues, is to be received with unquestioning assent. Every race is entitled to be judged by the totality of its mental products, not by the capacity which it has exhibited in a single direction of mental activity; and no reasonable man will deny to the unaided originators of a culture like the Chinese a place in the front rank of humanity. But the skill and effect with which they are handled does not save the tongues themselves from the reproach of rudimentariness; and whatever eminence the Chinese and Tibetans may have attained in philosophy must be said to be in spite of their speech rather than by its aid. To extol the logicalness of a language of roots can hardly fail to imply against one that has parts of speech and inflections the charge of being in some measure illogical.

W. D. W.

Old-Latin Biblical Texts. No. I. The Gospel according to Matthew. From the St. Germain MS (*g*₁), edited by JOHN WORDSWORTH, M. A., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture.

This volume is the first instalment of a series which is apparently intended to deal exhaustively with the difficult question of the relations between the Vulgate and those Latin versions of the New Testament which are earlier than the days of Jerome; and it will be welcomed by all students of the New Testament, not only on account of the access which its collations will give to MSS either inaccessible to the majority of scholars, or, worse still, misrepresented by previous editors, but also as an indication of the progress which Professor Wordsworth is making with the promised edition of the Vulgate which he has undertaken for the delegates of the Clarendon Press.

It is probably on account of the neglect with which this celebrated MS (*g*₁) has been treated by the present generation of scholars, that Wordsworth has decided to give it the first place in the series of so-called Old-Latin texts; and he points out that the majority of those who have used the text have employed the unreliable collation of Martianay, to the enumeration of whose errors Wordsworth devotes an appendix of nearly 12 pages for the Gospel of St. Matthew alone. It almost seems as if collators were born, not made.

The MS is generally referred to the ninth century, and is the second volume of a Bible of which the first was lost, according to the editor, between the years 1540 and 1680. It was formerly in the library of the Abbey of St. Germain des Prés, near Paris, and is now in the National Library (Fonds Latin 11553). From the Abbey it, of course, derives its name and notation *g*₁, *i. e.* the first of the Italic MSS of St. Germain. This notation we are sorry to see that Wordsworth proposes to change so that it reads, in the volume under consideration, *G*₁, and will do so in the forthcoming edition of the Vulgate. A curse worse than that of Shakspeare's epitaph might be invoked upon the heads of those who alter, unnecessarily, the notation of New Testa-

ment MSS. It will, of course, involve more trouble in printing, for every one who quotes G_1 will add (g_1 Tisch.), and every one who gives g_1 will add (G_1 Wordsw.). The description of the MS given by M. Delisle, in his 'Inventaire des MSS de Saint Germain des Prés,' informs us that the book contains 'Notes tironiennes dans les marges.' The editor has recorded the pages of the MS upon which these Tironian signs may be found, and remarks that they are 'apparently glosses to passages in the same folios,' though it does not appear that he had any other grounds for this than pure conjecture, since he adds that 'I believe they have not as yet been read.'

Considering that the whole subject of these short-hand marks has been exhaustively dealt with in recent years, we venture to suggest that some German scholar might have been found to decipher them. Ninth century glosses, if such they should turn out to be, are sometimes worth reading, not to mention that they may serve to fix the date and place of production (by authors that are quoted) with greater accuracy than has been thus far attained.

On p. ix the editor remarks, "The pages are divided into two columns, each ruled with 52 lines, and *there are on an average 37-38 letters to a line.*" He does not, however, recognize, what this statement involves, that the MS has preserved the ancient hexameter form of writing, the average hexameter being in Greek 37-38 letters. And since we may affirm generally that the majority of early errors in New Testament MSS are functions of lines whose length is given (being in length usually whole verses of poetry, or multiples and sub-multiples of the same), it follows that the MS should have been reproduced in its original arrangement as nearly as possible, in order that light may be thrown upon the compass of the variants and upon genesis of the separate errors. Mr. Wordsworth does nothing of the sort, but presents the text as it might stand in a printed Latin Bible. The time will come when all editors will feel the fitness of presenting a codex, as far as possible, in the shape in which they find it.

On the xiith page of the Introduction are collected the prefaces, etc., of the separate Pauline Epistles, together with an enumeration of the number of verses contained in each. These data are very interesting; for the whole of the epistles we are told "Habet Apostolus versus $\overline{\text{IIII. DCCCC. LXVIIIIC.}}$ " W. does not explain the meaning of this terminal C; the MS originally numbered 4968 verses (hexameters) in the Pauline Epistles, but on a later leaf, Fol. 183, 2: 'Epistulae Apostoli XIII ad Romanos usque ad Philemonem numerum uersus computantur . . . uersus V milia.' It appears that a correction was therefore made, by placing C as a correction over LXVIII, and, as so often happens in MSS, a later transcriber brought the correction into line with the rest of the script; cf. the reading Βεωροσφ in the Sinaitic Codex for Βερόρ and Βοσρόρ .

The very same process has taken place in some other figures cited by W. The second epistle to the Corinthians is said to be 'Scribta de Macedonia uersus ΔLXX° ,' to which the editor adds '*forte* uersus $\Delta\text{L, XX capitula}$.' This is quite wrong; what happened was that the scribe, who preserves the old Greek stichometry of Euthalius and earlier writers, did not understand the symbol for 90, which he took for 60; he thus wrote ΔLX , and a later hand inserted XC over the last two figures. These have crept into the text. The

mistake is repeated in the subscription to the Galatians: 'Scribita de urbe Roma uersi CCLXIIIIXC (*forte* uersus CCLXIII, cap X).' The proper number of verses to the Galatians is 293, and this is an early writer made into 263, resulting in the correction and error as before. The same error in reading the sign for 90 is found in the subscription to Titus, which has 67 verses instead of 97, and in 1 Thess.

The common confusion between H and N has given rise to an error in Philippians, which has 350 verses instead of 208.

When these corrections are made, it will be found that the stichometry agrees almost exactly with that of Euthalius and the early Greek MSS, an important result for the stichometer, as showing that the earlier Latin versions did not make a new count of their text when translated. We find then as follows:

	MSS	Cod. g ₁ (G ₁ Wordsw.)		MSS	Cod. g ₁ (G ₁ Wordsw.)
Romans	920	911	1 Thess.	194	193
1 Cor.	870	870	2 Thess.	108	108
2 Cor.	590	590	1 Tim.	230	230
Gal.	293	293	2 Tim.	172	172
Ephes.	312	312	Philem.	38	34
Philip.	208	308	Hebrews	703	700
Coloss.	208	208			

There are other deficiencies in the edition which are disappointing to the paleographer; at the end of the letter to Damasus is 'a sort of wheel full of numbers, apparently some arrangement of the Canons which follow on 4½ pages.' This wheel might easily have been reproduced, as the scribe's monograms were. And, indeed, the whole of the MS might have been printed, instead of merely the first Gospel. The fragments of Hermas at the close of the book have, according to the editor, never been collated, nor does it appear that, as far as he is concerned, they ever will be. We could willingly spare the life and epitaph of Dr. John Walker (who collated the MS for Bentley), if we might have instead the few leaves of the Vulgate of Hermas.

On p. xlii there is a remark which is likely to mislead the N. T. critic; the editor reprints the opening verses of St. John's Gospel in the Codex Amiatinus, which he describes as a MS written in stichi, as follows:

IN PRINCIPIO ERAT VERBUM
 ET VERBUM ERAT APUD \overline{DM}
 ET \overline{DS} ERAT VERBUM
 HOC ERAT IN PRINCIPIO APUD \overline{DM}
 OMNIA PER IPSUM FACTA SUNT
 ET SINE IPSO FACTUM EST NIHIL
 QUOD FACTUM EST
 IN IPSO VITA ERAT
 ET VITA ERAT LUX HOMINUM

And he remarks "It is clear that the scribe intended to connect 'Quod factum est' with 'in ipso vita erat' as the largest number of early Latin, as well as

Greek, MSS do. Tischendorf and Tregelles, strange to say, both overlook this, or rather point the sentence wrongly."

If any one will compare the text as it stands above with the oldest form of the Greek text, that given in Codex B, as follows:

ΕΝΑΡΧΗΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΚΑΙ
ΟΛΟΓΟΧΗΝΠΡΟΤΟΝΘΝ
ΚΑΙΘΧΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΟΥΤΟC
ΗΝΕΝΑΡΧΗΠΡΟΤΟΝΘΝ
ΠΑΝΤΑΔΙΑΥΤΟΥΕΓΕΝΕ
ΤΟΚΑΙΧΩΡΙCΑΥΤΟΥΕΓΕΝ
ΕΤΟΟΥΔΕΕΝΟΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ
ΕΝΑΥΤΩΖΩΗΗΝΚΑΙΗ

I think he will come to the conclusion that the Codex Amiatinus represents the breaking-up of a text formerly written in half-hexameters and which is being replaced by writing in cola and commata; and so far from it being clear that the scribe intended to connect the words in question, it might even be maintained by some that he has expressly separated them by moving the new line 'in ipso vita erat' to the right; but whether this is the case or not, the MS is not a stichometric one in any accurate use of the term.

We shall look with interest for the publication of the rest of the Codex, and for the promised editions of Codex Bobbiensis (*k*) and Codex Monacensis (*q*), both of which will be based on Tischendorf's transcripts and a correction of the same by the MSS themselves.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. By F. H. A. SCRIVENER.

Third edition, thoroughly revised, enlarged and brought down to the present date, 1883.

The feeling of expectation and interest with which the announcement of a new edition of this work was received is scarcely justified by the perusal of its pages; which are singularly conservative, not only with regard to the most important questions of N. T. criticism (where, indeed, a certain cautiousness is both necessary and commendable), but also of multitudinous errors which disfigured previous editions, and many of which must have been pointed out over and over again. We shall confine ourselves in the present article to some noteworthy points in the first hundred pages of the new edition.

One of the first things which will strike an American reader in the new edition is the altered tone of the writer with regard to Cis-Atlantic scholars. The following is an instructive instance: Ed. 2, p. 85, note 2: "Abbot, Comparative Antiquity of the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts, *ubi supra*, p. 195. This writer adopts in controversy a tone which has happily become obsolete among scholars on our side of the Atlantic; yet by a diligent use of the materials supplied by Vercellone and Cozza's Roman edition of the Codex Vaticanus (1868-70) and of other documents, he has no doubt shaken the

arguments by which Mr. Burgon seeks to demonstrate that the Sinaitic manuscript is younger than its rival in the Vatican by 50, by 75 or by 100 years."

Two American names are misspelt; p. 301, for 'Luther Farnhaus' read 'Luther Farnham,' and for 'Is. H. Hull,' pp. 327, 485, 546, and Index 2, read 'Isaac H. Hall.'

The following are some of the points which we have noted as requiring attention or correction: P. 27, note 2. In describing the very important phenomenon of the prevalence of early tri-columnar Greek codices, S. notes "To this not slender list, Mr. E. Maunde Thompson enables us to annex B. M. addit. 24142, a Flemish Latin Bible of the eleventh century." The remark had already been made by Mr. Bond in his Report on the Utrecht Psalter; Bond makes the copy to be of the 9th or 10th century, and, which is much more important, affirms that it is the preservation of an earlier similar arrangement.

P. 28, note: The Utrecht Psalter is said to be in three columns, but to bear marks of having been transcribed from an archetype containing only two. This may be so, but I cannot tell upon what grounds S. bases his opinion. In the report on the Psalter, p. 2, Mr. E. A. Bond affirms the contrary: "In the case of the Psalter there is evidence in the illustrative drawings that it has been copied from an earlier original. The drawings in the first MS extended across the page as was common in early times, and the text was written in three columns; and, therefore, for the same purpose of preserving the original arrangement, the form of the letters as well as the three columns was repeated."

P. 48, l. 12: The abbreviated form of *παρθένης*, *παρνος* with θ superscript, is found in the Bodleian Genesis, both with and without the superscript bar that denotes abbreviation; cf. f. 41 B., l. 22. The variation should be noted, as it explains how, in the absence of the line, the transition could be made from *πρὸς παρθενοῦς* to *πρὸς πάρθονος* in subscription to early copies of the 1st Epistle of John. The whole of this section (15) is very incomplete. No attempt is made to discriminate between earlier and later tachygraphy, nor to derive one from the other. Many forms of abbreviation which are common enough in well-known MSS are not referred to; e. g. the curious forms in Codex P for *μαρ*, *αν*, *ἐπιστολῃ*, etc., cf. I John II, Jude, etc. With regard to the *compendia scribendi* such as those used for *πρὸς* or *καί* being found at the ends of lines, the statement may be extended; almost all early tachygraphs are terminal, and are found in the close of the line or the last line of the page; where they occur otherwise they generally indicate an *unreduced terminal abbreviation of the exemplar copied*.

P. 50: A little over two pages is devoted to the subject of stichometry; a subject which has been much investigated during the last half-century, and with most important results, of which S. does not seem aware, since he gives in the addenda his last word on the subject, which is, in brief, a reference to Prideaux' Connections, for illustration of the statement that the *στίχος* is a sense-line. After that, one is almost afraid to refer him to Ritschl, Graux, Wachsmuth, or the American Journal of Philology. If he believes the *στίχος* is a sense-line, he might at least have quoted Blass in support of his position.

Let us ask a question here: assuming S. to be right in his hypothesis, supported as he is by Prideaux and other primeval writers, and right also in

the multitude of MSS which he declares to be either stichometric or copied from stichometric MSS, how does he reconcile the extreme variation in the lengths of the lines of the MSS so designated with his own statement that the numbers of *στίχοι* given in the subscriptions are near enough to prove that they were divided on the same principle? For example, Codex Laudianus might be contrasted with Codex Bezae or with H of St. Paul's Epistles. The fact is that the *στίχος* is an average hexameter, and only in a loose and general sense is applied to sense-lines at all.

On p. 50, last line, for 41 read 31.

P. 51: Here there is the usual confusion over the work of Euthalius in the arrangement and stichometry of the Acts and Epistles. Dr. S. adds to the misunderstanding by a series of personal disagreements with himself, which are common indeed throughout the volume; e. g. p. 50, l. 18, Euthalius' edition of St. Paul's Epistles thus divided was published A. D. 458, that of the Acts and Epistles A. D. 490. P. 61, l. 14: "Soon after (*αὐτίκα ὅττα* is his own expression) the publication of St. Paul's Epistles, on the suggestion of one Athanasius . . . Euthalius put forth a similar edition of the Acts and Catholic Epistles."

Again, p. 51, l. 21: "Who distributed the *στίχοι* of the Gospels . . . does not appear." P. 62, l. 12: "He (Euthalius) is also said . . . to have been the author of that reckoning of the *στίχοι* which is annexed in most copies to the Gospels as well as to the Acts and Epistles."

The second note on the foot of p. 51 should have been more full, considering the importance of the MS referred to. I do not think there is any stichometric number at the close of Philemon. As for the *ρπ* at the close of II Thess., I am inclined to believe it a corruption of *ργ*; with an unabbreviated reckoning upon Westcott and Hort's text, I find 112 sixteen-syllabled hexameters, which comes very near to the supposed 113. In II Cor. *κ* has *χιβ* or 612, and by an unabbreviated count as before we have 610. Several of the other figures are corrupt.

P. 71, l. 4: "In the Pauline Epistles, that to the Hebrews precedes the four Pastoral Epistles, and immediately follows the second to the Thessalonians in the four great codices, Vaticanus," etc. Codex B does not contain the Pastoral Epistles, as S. admits in Addenda, on p. 102.

P. 89 fin.: "Words are divided at the end of a line as capriciously as can be imagined; thus *κ* in *οὐκ* is repeatedly separated without need." For *capriciously* read *regularly*, and dele *thus* and *without need*. Dr. S. seems to have imbibed the idea of the first editor of the Herculanean Rolls, who was struck with surprise at the same phenomenon and remarked (Vol. Herc. Coll. Neap. I 25): 'Vide amanuensis nostri imperitiam sive oscitantiam qui unam syllabam *οὐχ* bifariam divisit, litteram *χ* in inferiorem lineam trahens, quasi ad sequens *ἐπὶ* pertinere.' A more correct idea may be obtained from Kühner, Greek Gram. I 273, or from Hort, Introduction, p. 315.

P. 93, l. 14: For 90 read 91. S. suggests that the missing leaves of Sinaiticus might have contained either the Acts of Paul or the Revelation of Peter, and refers to the Codex Claromontanus, which has catalogued these books. According to the authority quoted, the Acts of Paul contains 3560 verses and the Revelation of Peter 270; we are therefore invited to choose between two

books, one of which is about 13 times the size of the other, and neither of which is likely to agree with the compass of the missing pages.

P. 98: In the 2d edition, S. adopted the brilliant conjecture of Tregelles as to the origin of the connexion between S. Thecla and the Alexandrian Codex, according to which the Arabic inscription as to the saint is due to the fact that the MS in its present form begins with the lesson for S. Thecla's day (Matt. XXV 1, 13). Of this S. wrote: "It is hardly too much to say that Tregelles' shrewd conjecture seems to be certain, almost to demonstration." He now writes: "It seems a fatal objection to this shrewd conjecture, as Mr. E. Maunde Thompson points out, that the Arabic numeration of the leaf, set in the *verso* of the lower margin, itself posterior in date to the Arabic note relating to Thecla, is 26; so that the 25 leaves now lost must have been still extant when the note was written." There is surely some misunderstanding here; there is no 26 on the page in question except the mark for the beginning of the 26th chapter, and the Arabic note at the lower margin, which has been cut away, is calculated by Thompson as 667. With regard to the priority of the numeration over the inscription or *vice versa*, E. M. Thompson, in the British Museum facsimile, does not express himself so strongly as might be inferred from Scrivener; his language is to the effect that the Arabic note about Thecla is of the 13th or 14th century, and that the leaves are numbered with Arabic numerals of the 14th century. The priority is, to say the least, doubtful, and under such circumstances Tregelles' conjecture ought to stand unchallenged.

P. 103, l. 5: Codex B is described as follows: "Each column contains forty-two lines," etc. Not in the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, nor I Reg. to XIX 11; nor in II Paralip. X 16 to XXVI 13. The first of these groups is an exact number of folios containing 44 lines to a column; the second is a 40-lined folio.

P. 101: "It (Codex B) is a quarto volume, arranged in quires of five sheets, or ten leaves each, like . . . Codex Rossanensis to be described hereafter." On p. 158 we find Codex Rossanensis described, and are told "as in Codex B, the sheets are ranged in *quaternions*."

P. 131, l. 29: For Frag. 5 read Frag. 6.

We have no space at present to discuss Scrivener's treatment of the important problems of the grouping of N. T. documents and of Hort's theory of the Syrian recension. The omission is, however, the less important, as Dr. S. has no theory of his own to offer, except an empirical suggestion that BC might be a better group to follow than αB (p. 553). We may conclude with p. 552, l. 15: "Enough of the weary and ungracious task of finding fault."

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Acta Thomae. Graece partim cum novis codicibus contulit partim primus edidit, etc., MAX BONNET. Lipsiae, 1883.

All students of the wide subject of Christian apocryphal literature will welcome this attempt to deal exhaustively with the early romances which have the apostle Thomas for their central figure; and the present volume is especially valuable in consequence of the fact, which was brought to light by

Wright's translation of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles from the Syriac, and by the fragments edited and translated from the Ethiopic by S. C. Malan, that not more than half of the book had been published by Thilo and Tischendorf. Professor Bonnet has now produced as the result of most laborious research in the National Library, the text of the whole of the Acts of Thomas in Greek, together with the account of the miracles and passion of the apostle in Latin. It is to the first of these that interest especially attaches itself. That tradition and romance were early occupied with the preaching of Thomas in India (a legend growing round a fact, as we believe) may be seen from the stichometric table of Nicephorus, in which, amongst the N. T. apocrypha, are numbered

Περίοδος Θωμᾶ· στίχοι ,αψ'
Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Θωμᾶν στίχοι ,ατ'.

It would be interesting to know whether Prof. Bonnet believes there is any relation between the 'Travels of Thomas,' here recorded, and the 'Acts,' as he has published them. I do not see (though perhaps I have overlooked the point) that he has alluded to them. If a rough calculation, which I made on Bonnet's text, is to be depended upon, it would seem that the 'Acts' were mutilated in very early days, before the time of Nicephorus, that is saec. ix, and that the book as published by Tischendorf is very nearly of the same compass as indicated by the stichometric table. I made 1500 verses by a rough approximation, Nicephorus says 1700.

The portions of the book which have been now first edited will be seen by the following arrangement. Imagine the book to be made up of four parts, A, B, C, D, then A and C are found in the former editions, while B and D are due to the energy of Prof. Bonnet's research. And the dimensions of the parts will be as follows, as may be seen by counting the lines in the present edition or in any other way: A is almost exactly double of C, and C is, but not so closely, six times B; and the remainder of the book is almost exactly double of A. It appears, therefore, that if B were a lost quaternion or, perhaps, leaf, the portion restored by Bonnet consists of the 13th quaternion or leaf, and about 24 quaternions or leaves which follow the 19th quaternion. Whether the piece marked B was a single leaf or group of leaves I will not attempt to decide.

The Acts themselves are very entertaining reading, and show traces, as already suggested, of accretion of legend round earlier accounts, as is common in apocryphal literature. They throw light upon the ritual of the period when they were produced, by oblique allusions which are made to the ceremonies of the church; as, for example, when Thomas, at a certain marriage feast, receives oil and odors wherewith to anoint himself, he is observed to perform the rite of ecclesiastical unction upon himself by anointing his head, nostrils, ears, teeth and breast. At least so it seems that the legend must be interpreted. The tradition agrees with the Syriac romance, which contains the acts of Addai the apostle, in affirming the gratuitous character of early Christian preaching; as, for example, when (p. 44) the apostle Thomas is preaching in India, and is addressed by a high military official in the words ἀκήκοα περὶ σοῦ ὅτι μισθὸν παρά τινος οὐ λαμβάνεις, ἀλλ' ὅπερ καὶ ἔχεις τοῖς δεομένοις παρέχεις, from

which it appears that the communistic instincts of Christianity survived long after their exercise had been discarded.

It is, however, impossible to discuss in detail the many points of interest that arise in connection with these romances, and we must content ourselves with expressing gratitude for Prof. Bonnet's laborious and valuable researches.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

The Iroquois Book of Rites. Edited by HORATIO HALE, M. A. D. G. Brinton, Philadelphia, 1883. 8vo, 222 pp.

The Güegüence: a comedy-ballet in the Nahuatl-Spanish dialect of Nicaragua. Edited by DANIEL G. BRINTON, A. M., M. D. D. G. Brinton, Philadelphia, 1883. 8vo, pp. lii, 94.

Aboriginal American Authors and their Productions, especially those in the native languages. A chapter in the history of literature. By DANIEL G. BRINTON, A. M., M. D. Philadelphia, No. 115 South Seventh Street, 1883. Small 8vo, pp. viii, 63.

The two first of the above-named books form volumes two and three of Dr. Brinton's "Library of Aboriginal American Literature," of which the first volume gives the "Maya Chronicles," published by him in 1882. Other volumes, it is announced, to be edited by Gatschet, Bandelier and other eminent scholars, will soon appear.

Mr. Hale's book may be said to make an epoch in North American Indian history, giving, as it does, a clearer insight than we have had before into the political constitution and fortunes, and the personal character of the famous "Six Nations," who played so prominent a part in the land before and during the Revolutionary War. The body of the work consists of the text and translation of the "Ancient Rites of the Condoling Council," that is, the ceremonies observed on the decease of a member of the Council and the induction of his successor. It is here given in two parts: the book of the Older Nations, in the Canienga (Mohawk) tongue, from two copies, one in the possession of Chief J. S. Johnson (a grandson of Sir William Johnson), of the Canadian Reservation, transcribed by him in 1832 from the copy of an old chief, the other held by Chief John Buck, the official keeper of the wampum records of the confederacy; and the book of the Younger Nations, in the Onondaga dialect, which was found "on the small Reservation in the State of New York, near Syracuse [Onondaga Castle], where a feeble remnant of the great Onondaga nation still cling to the home of their forefathers." Writing was introduced among these Indians by the English (Church of England) missionaries in the early part of the last century, fortunately not too late to preserve this curious and valuable bit of literature. Merely as literature it is not without interest, and will bear comparison with some of the Vedic hymns in tenderness of sentiment and vigor of language; though its chief importance is the testimony it furnishes to the mature character of the confederation of the Six Nations. The assembled chieftains express their sorrow for the loss of the deceased, address words of sympathy and condolence to the bereaved friends, and call upon the revered ancestors, the founders of the league. The reader needs a commentary in order to understand the poem, and he will find

all desired information in the introduction and notes, where Mr. Hale discusses the history and constitution of the league at length. Its founder was Hiawatha, an Onondaga chief, believed by Mr. Morgan (in his "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family") and Mr. Hale (both depending on native testimony) to have lived in the 15th century.

Mr. Hale takes occasion to explain the singular fortune by which the eminent Onondaga statesman, through a confusion of his name with that of an Ojibway deity, has taken the shape, in Mr. Schoolcraft's "Hiawatha Legends" and Longfellow's poem, of a mythical hero or demigod. The hero will doubtless keep his place in our literature, but we may hope that the rehabilitation of the statesman will also prove permanent. If the information which has been so industriously collected from the surviving members of the great league is to be relied on, Hiawatha must be reckoned among the notable sages and law-givers of the world. He found the tribes isolated, and consumed by wars among themselves; he conceived and realized the idea of a federal union, capable of indefinite territorial expansion, which was to secure peace, and he planned and in part executed great industrial improvements. For the history of the formation of the league, its constitution, its fortunes, the character of the "clans," and the great civilization of the Iroquois, we must refer the reader to Mr. Hale's Introduction, where will be found also a short account of the language. We heartily concur in the author's protest against the common opinion that the Iroquois and the redmen generally were ferocious savages. In the wars waged for home and life against the European invaders it was to be expected that the harder side of their nature should come out; but their history shows them to have had many of the domestic and social virtues of civilization, and they would not suffer, even in their more cruel traits, by comparison with the Spanish conquerors of Mexico and Peru, or the English and French barons and ecclesiastics of the fifteenth century. In one point we hesitate to follow Mr. Hale. In note F of the Appendix he reproduces from a former work (essay on "Indian Migrations, as evidenced by Language," published in the "American Antiquarian," January and April, 1883) the theory, based on a comparison between the Basque and the American Indian languages, that the early, non-Aryan Europeans were of the same race as the Indians of America. The linguistic and other facts appear to be an insufficient basis for the view that the ancestors of the redmen once dwelt in the British Islands and on the western coasts of the continent of Europe, and thence made their way by canoes across the Atlantic to America, and that the self-respect, love of liberty and capacity for self-government which characterize the modern European nations are derived, not from Indo-European but from Iberian ancestry. In the main points, however, Mr. Hale has done his work well, and we are under great obligation to him for the zeal and ability he has shown in bringing out this new side of Indian history and life.

The third volume of the "Library" is the amusing comedy-ballet of the Güegüence, text and translation, the text obtained by Dr. Berendt in 1874, the translation now given for the first time by Dr. Brinton. It is written in the Nahuatl-Spanish dialect, a jargon that grew up as a means of communication between the natives and their European conquerors. The Nahuas are believed by the editor, on the testimony of native tradition and of language,

to be an Aztec people who came to Nicaragua as invaders and obtained a settlement there. The reasons assigned by Dr. Brinton for regarding this play as the production of a native author seem to be sound, namely, that it is not at all religious (as were the dramas introduced by the Spanish priests as substitutes for the native *bailes*), nor modeled after the Spanish secular comedy; the female characters are mute, there are no monologues or soliloquies, no separation into scenes, no prologue, epilogue, or chorus, while there is much wearisome repetition of phrases, and "the business of the play is strictly within the range of the native thought and emotion." The characters are the Spanish Governor, with his Alguacil, Secretary and Registrar, the hero Güegüence, with his two sons, the Governor's daughter, and a number of mules. The Güegüence, an impudent cheat of a pedlar, coming to the town to sell his wares and perform his ballet, is summoned before the Governor (whose poverty has forced him to order the discontinuance of the public amusements) for entering the province without a permit; the fun of the piece consists in the witticisms of the pedlar, his tricks, and the shrewdness with which he finally escapes punishment and procures a marriage between one of his sons and the daughter of the Governor. Of the two sons, the older is an accomplice of his father, while the younger exposes and denounces him; the Governor is a butt, he and his officers merely serving to elicit the hero's wit; the daughter is a silent figure; the male personages, and the mules, who are represented by men, dance. It is all rude and coarse, but not without humor. In the Introduction the editor describes the Nahuas and Mangles of Nicaragua, their *bailes* or dramatic dances, and their music and musical instruments, gives the history of the baile del Güegüence, describes and explains the *dramatis personae*, and adds an epitome of the story. At the end of the book there are helpful notes, a vocabulary and an index. The layman as well as the scholar in Indian literature will find a mass of interesting matter in the work. We notice only one oversight, "toll" for "doubloons" (Spanish *doblones*), in the translation, p. 21.

Dr. Brinton's memoir on Aboriginal American Authors is an enlargement of a paper read by him before the Congrès International des Américanistes, at Copenhagen, in 1883. "It does not pretend," he says in his preface, "to be an exhaustive bibliographical essay, but was designed merely to point out to an intelligent and sympathetic audience a number of relics of Aboriginal American literature, and to bespeak the aid and influence of that learned body in the preservation and publication of these rare documents." If not exhaustive, the memoir is a very striking exhibition of Indian literature, narrative, didactic, oratorical, poetical and dramatic, over a large part of the eastern part of the continent, from Eskimoland to the Isthmus of Panama, and down to Peru. The list furnishes abundant proof that there is much American literature that is worth preserving, and at the same time justifies Dr. Brinton's lament over "the utter and incredible neglect which, up to this hour, has prevailed with regard to the preservation of relics of native literature which we know have existed—which do still exist." The authors of these works are of all characters and social grades, from unknown Nicaraguans to Onondaga chiefs and Peruvian Incas. Hardly a beginning has been made in collecting the Indian folk-songs. Many historical works yet await editing and publica-

tion. Not a few books of rites, with accounts of calendars, and legends and myths, need translation and illustration. Dr. Brinton's sketch of the literature enables us to see what has been done, and how much remains to be done.

It is to be hoped that the Indian publications which Dr. Brinton is issuing will meet with a wide circle of readers, and that others besides scholars of this department will interest themselves to aid the work he has so vigorously and successfully begun. To his call on "learned societies, enlightened governments, liberal institutions, and individuals throughout the world" to help preserve the native American literature, there should be many Americans, at least, to respond.

C. H. TOY.

Encyklopaedie und Methodologie der Romanischen Philologie, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Französischen von GUSTAV KÖRTING. Erster Theil. Erstes Buch: Erörterung der Vorbegriffe. Zweites Buch: Einleitung in das Studium der Romanischen Philologie. 8vo, pp. xvi + 244. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1884.

Just a quarter of a century ago, Prof. Bernhard Schmitz, of the University of Greifswald, wrote a so-called *Encyclopaedia* of the philological study of the modern languages, to which three supplements, each of two editions, appeared at different dates reaching down to 1881. As a special supplement to the second edition (1876) Prof. Varnhagen, of Erlangen, published a list of all Programmes, Dissertations, and Habilitationsschriften since 1830, as well as of smaller articles and reviews that were scattered through newspapers, etc., up to 1877. A sort of continuation of the original undertaking was also begun in 1866 by Schmitz in *Die Neuesten Fortschritte der Französisch-Englischen Philologie*, the last number of which, together with a new (second) edition of the whole work, came out six years later. These imperfect attempts at giving us a general survey of the progress of Romance philology and at establishing the beginnings of a Romance methodology were the only ones that had been made in this field up to the appearance of Prof. Körtling's work, cited above. It will be seen from the comprehensive title what the general character of the proposed work is. It is the first of three octavo volumes that are to cover especially the development of Romance philology, beginning with broad notions of linguistics, and in each successive volume narrowing down to the more specific details required by the specialist alone. No. II of the series will constitute an *encyclopaedia* of Romance philology as a whole, while No. III will be devoted to the individual languages, their dialects, etc.

The author is careful at the outset of his enterprise to have us clearly understand what he means by *encyclopaedia*; that is, it is neither a dictionary nor a general bibliography, but such a judicious selection and classification of the most important works published in each department, with succinct, pointed remarks on their relative values, as shall enable the student to find his way about understandingly in the immense mass of material with which he comes into contact from the beginning of his studies. It is not, therefore, intended to give here a complete survey of all that has been written, either directly or indirectly, on this new science, but simply to set up the finger-posts and note the most essential points along the line of march by which we have arrived at the position now occupied by it.

Throughout this first volume the writer nowhere gets away from the domain of general statement. In his discussion of language and the division of languages, of written signs and literature, of the idea of philology with its well defined lines of demarkation setting off distinct categories of linguistic relations, we find him upon ground similar to that of any one else treating the broad principles that underlie this subject. It is in the second book that he works into his proper theme, but only to give us here an introduction to what he purposes to carry out in the later volumes. This part is particularly suited to beginners in Romance philology who have need of becoming acquainted with the leading men in the field and their chief productions. The only school, however, that is faithfully represented is the German. This is natural when we think that the book sprang out of a course of lectures delivered to students in the author's special department. In the auxiliary studies suggested for the Romance student, such as Low Latin, mediaeval history, etc., the writer shows a most wise judgment, and the material offered is sufficiently varied and abundant to start the uninitiated well on his way towards drawing material benefit from them. Prof. Körting belongs to the strictly conservative school of German Romance scholars, who hold that in the Late Latin thought, language and traditions we have to seek the principal source of our Modern Romance thought, language and traditions, and hence the great stress he lays upon this side of his subject. In the next to the last chapter of his book he has given us a rough sketch of the history of Romance studies in Europe, confining himself more particularly again to Germany and to the work of German scholars. This proneness, in truth, to stick closely to the home workshop—a lack of the "note of catholicity"—is the chief weakness of his present volume, which we hope to see corrected in those that are to follow.

A concluding chapter on the academic study of Romance philology bears only on its position in the German universities, and hence does not concern us much. It is of interest, however, thus far, that we are able to see in it how we ourselves stand alongside of institutions where this subject has been fostered for nearly a quarter of a century, and how it has developed into extraordinary proportions with the right kind of men to lead in it. Notwithstanding the very general character of the matter here treated, and, for the most part, its Teutonic exclusiveness, we must recommend the work as the only fair specimen of a legitimate encyclopaedia that the Romance department has yet produced. We have a right to expect in the succeeding volumes broader views and richer details bearing upon important results reached in this field outside of Germany.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Zur Geschichte des Lateinischen *c* vor *e* und *i* im Romanischen, von Dr. ADOLF HORNING. 8vo., pp. 140. Halle, Niemeyer, 1883.

To trace the history of the Latin *c* in its passage into the Neo-Latin idioms has been one of the most difficult problems of Romance phonology. This difficulty arises from the great variety of values assumed by the original guttural in the different modern languages, sticking, as it does in some cases, to the traditions of its primitive estate, in others passing into voiceless or voiced spirants according as it is initial, medial or final, and then again jumping over into the palatal mould with all the ease apparently that the semi-vowels manifest in the divers changes of their mobile character.

In 1874, M. Joret, one of the most skilled French dialect-phoneticians, wrote a work entitled "Du *c* dans les langues romanes," in which the main lines of the problem were stated and discussed with clearness and acumen, but he did not investigate the more special conditions under which the Latin palatal *c* passed on the one hand into sonant, on the other into mute consonants. Professor Fritz Neumann, of the University of Freiburg, attempted to fill up this gap, in 1878, in his able treatise "Zur Laut- und Flexionslehre des Altfranzösischen," where he promulgated his celebrated doctrine known as das Neumannsche Gesetz, which was intended, in the first instance, to bear directly upon the French, and afterwards indirectly upon the whole range of Romance languages. This law may be formulated in somewhat the following terms:

Before the accent, Latin palatal *c* (likewise *ty*), when medial and between two vowels, passed into sonant consonants (*z*, *ž*, *dz*), after the accent it goes into mute (*ç*, *ts*, *č*, *š*).

Some strictures upon this general statement were made by Professor Schuchardt, of Graz, in a review of Windisch's Kurtzgefasste Irische Grammatik (Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie IV 143), where he holds that Neumann had not recognized the *punctum saliens* of the subject. On one side *cy*, *ty* should be placed, while on the other *C^{ts}* should stand. In this way position after the tonic could only come into consideration with *cy*, *ty*; and here they produced double consonance, as in Italian *palazzo*, *piaccio*. Thus the matter rested until the appearance of Horning's work last year. In this it is proposed to collect throughout the different Romance languages all the testimony possible in favor of, and against, the Neumann law, in other words, to try to throw light upon the mode of production of sonant and mute consonants out of the Latin *c*, and the author desires that this investigation may be considered as a supplement to the results obtained in Joret's work.

The languages taken up here for examination are: French proper, the Picard, the Modern Lorraine and Modern Wallonian dialects, the Franco-Provençal of Switzerland, Old Provençal, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese, Raetoromance, Italian (Old North-Italian, Old Tuscan and Modern Sicilian), and Wallachian.

The historical point of view from which the investigation starts is fourfold, namely: 1. All the languages are to be examined on the basis of the Neumann Law, but the results obtained for any one of them are not to be presupposed as existing for any other one of the languages. 2. The investigation must cover the oldest period of each language. This does not hinder the modern dialects from being considered. 3. Final *c*, of which Joret and Neumann do not take sufficient account, needs the same careful treatment as medial *c*. 4. *Ce* (*decem*), *ci* (*feci*), *cy* (*facio*), *ty* (*rationem*) are to be kept strictly separate. With reference to this latter point the author very properly notes how these phonetic categories are clearly differentiated in the Italian and the Raetoromance, while in Band XXV der Denkschriften der Wienerakademie, Mussafia shows us that Die catalonische metrische Version der Sieben Weisen Meister held final *ce* (*ci*), *ty* as a group distinctly separate from the combination *cy*. A valuable auxiliary for determining the law of development of voiceless and voiced spirants in French is found in the Vocabulaire Hébraïco-Français published in the first volume of Böhmer's Romanische Studien. Here the voiced spirant *s* is always

represented by Hebrew *š*, whether it comes from Latin *s* or *c*, the mute *s* by *š*, while mute *c* is given by *š*, which probably had the Latin *ts* sound. For the Spanish, too, the author finds interesting data in the newspapers published by the descendants of the Spanish Jews who, banished from Spain, settled in Vienna, Constantinople and other parts of the East. The language here is Spanish, but written in Hebrew characters, where *š* regularly represents voiceless *s* and *š* voiced *s*. For the other idioms the writer has made use of the latest aids at his command in the line of fragmentary texts, monographs and special journal articles, so that the treatise before us represents the latest phase of this difficult question, and is a decided step forward towards a discovery of these intricate relations in the modern languages of phonetic values, very diverse among themselves, but which have sprung from a simple product in the mother tongue. The results reached by Horning's admirable method may be summed up about as follows:

I. Final *ce*, *cy*, *ty*, wherever syncopation does not take place, become voiceless spirants, but this character of the spirant has nothing whatever to do with the accent. Spanish alone forms an exception to this rule.

II. Pretonic *ce* becomes voiced spirant or palatal throughout the greater portion of the Romance language territory. Middle, South Italian and Wallachian are the exceptions. Pretonic *ce* becomes also voiced consonant in North Italian, Spanish, Portuguese. French and Provençal are doubtful in their oldest form.

III. *Cy* + *e* is treated everywhere like simple *ce*.

IV. *Cy* + dark vowel, both before and after the accent, becomes voiceless spirant or palatal. Spanish is again the positive exception here, turning its *cy* in this case into voiced spirant. The circumstances in which pretonic *cy* passes into voiced consonants in French and Provençal is yet an unsolved problem. For *ty* the law is definite, at least, in French and Provençal, where as pretonic it gives regularly voiced spirants, while as post-tonic it produces voiceless spirants. In the other Romance languages the law was checked, especially by analogy, at an early period of its development. In Italian and Raetian only two words (*rationem*, *stationem*) have shown us the sonant. The first of these is the more interesting since throughout the Romance languages it has uniformly passed into the sonant state.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Der Troubadour Bertolome Zorzi. Herausgegeben von EMIL LEVY. Halle. Niemeyer, 1883.

The marked activity of Romance scholars for the last few years in editing critical texts of Provençal literature has awakened a new interest in everything pertaining to this transition period of intellectual life from the old to the modern civilization of South Europe. In accordance with this feeling, many of the leading Troubadours of Spain and South France have already received attention from able editors, while the Italian poets who wrote in Provençal have been for the most part sadly neglected. The Freiburg Habilitationsschrift, cited above, is a contribution toward supplying this deficiency. In 1880 this same editor gave us the first critical edition of the works of Figueira, who, though a Toulousian by birth, passed most of his life in Lombardy. Zorzi

was a native of Venice, and lived during the latter half of the thirteenth century, having taken an active part, according to an original Provençal biography of him, in the hard struggle for supremacy between Venice and Genoa. But notwithstanding his extreme patriotism and his enthusiasm for his native town, he was a friend of the celebrated Genoese poet, Bonifaci Calvo, with whom he stood in the most intimate relations, and to whom some of his poems are addressed. Zorzi's works, eighteen in number, are here collected and arranged according to the probable dates of their production, with remarks on the circumstances in which the poems were written, together with the *variae lectiones* of the three existing MSS in which they are contained, that is, Vatican 5232, and Bibl. nat. fr. 854 et 12473, known respectively as the A, I, and K MSS.

For his orthography the editor has followed A, and only where this failed him has that of I been called in. The character of the metre for each poem is clearly represented with all the changes and transpositions that belong to it, and also all the correspondences in the works of other Troubadours, so that we have in this little work a short historic survey of the different kinds of verse used by Zorzi as found throughout Provençal literature. At the heading of each poem the different places are given where it has been published before, in part or as a whole, and at the end of the volume the editor has supplied us with half a dozen pages of judicious notes, bearing only upon those points that are most necessary to a correct knowledge of the text. The only thing wanting to make the collection complete in itself is a well-arranged vocabulary. The difficulty that young scholars experience in getting, ready at hand, adequate and convenient glossaries for the Provençal ought to be sufficient reason in all such cases as this for furnishing a careful word-list of the text or texts edited.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Cædmon's Exodus and Daniel, edited from Grein. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph. D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Language in Princeton College. Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1883. [Second publication in the series "Library of Anglo-Saxon Poetry," issued under the general editorship of Prof. James A. Harrison.]

A reliable and convenient edition of the A. S. Exodus has been needed quite as much as of any other part of Grein's Bibliothek. Béowulf and Elene, the latter now in the second edition of Prof. Zupitza's excellent book, have had sufficient attention called to their merits, but the Exodus has languished like a younger son behind the somewhat frosty elder born Genesis; and Grein's, Thorpe's, and Bouterwek's editions of both poems and the Daniel are now about equally inaccessible. Prof. Hunt has furnished a text-book for college use, with notes and vocabulary. The notes especially give evidence of work, and the text is in the main a faithful reproduction of Grein's text. But it labors under two faults. With one exception the editor has paid no attention to Grein's list of errors and misprints given at the end of Vol. I, and has reprinted the text with its errors (luckily not very many) upon its head. The second fault is due to an unfortunate system of accentuation. The first book in the series (Béowulf) retained Heyne's, which in the main agrees with Grein's. The system has never been popular in England and America, and nearly all German scholars have abandoned it. But its retention by the Amer-

ican editors showed at least conservatism and *pietät*. Prof. Hunt has left the old paths, but only to launch into confusion. His accentuation of the diphthongs (ĕā, ĕō) would be an improvement if it represented with him a part of any defined system. The change of Grein's ā to æ is also good. But why did the editor omit to change Grein's æ to æ̃? The result is that in scores of instances in the text æ and æ̃ are not distinguished. The editor prints dæg wæs mære (for mære). Whenever, then, ê, the variant of æ̃, occurs, the vowel is accented long, and forms like mære, mære stand peaceably together in the glossary. But the variations do not cease here. The form æ (for æ̃ *law*) occurs Dan. 751 and elsewhere in the text, æ̃ in the glossary, while a number of compounds in the glossary receive no accent whatever. The text has ær (for æ̃r), the glossary a new accentuation æ̃r, but the compound æ̃rdæg has none. Similarly anmōd and ānpað (should be ānpæð) stand side by side, while béag in the text becomes beag in the glossary. The following list of words, falsely accented in the vocabulary, might be largely increased: bæl (bael is the form given), bême, bréost, cigeān, êðfynde, flōðblāc, fūl, gehāten (past part.), gecȳðan. Fully one quarter of the verbs in 1 (first conj.) are given with unaccented i in the present (gebīdan, etc.).

The editor uniformly accents the preterite endings of the second weak conj. (-ōde), though he leaves Grein's -ode in the text (mōdgōde, Ex. 458, etc.). This is the way in which March accents, but the editor does not refer to March nor yet to the discrepancy between text and glossary, and appears to be quite unaware of the excellent theory Grein followed (cf. Sievers, *Beiträge*, V 66, 82, etc.).

For a list of the frequent and vexatious misprints in the glossary, such as āfæstīnan for āfæstnian, bæman for bærnān, deōf for deop, there is no space here. But some, at least, of the following errors cannot be so explained: ābreceān (for ābroceān), the same mistake occurring under breceān and forbreceān, forgetān figures as perf. part. of forgitan, galen is given as the infinitive, aldor (*vita*) is said to be a fem. of the 2 decl. gen. e, a form ferhðloce is given as masc., dreoran, drear (both unaccented) are given as the proper infinitive and preterite, dreosan, dreas being merely added in parenthesis, and ben(n), gen. e, fem. is given with the meanings *prayer, entreaty*. The word means a *wound*, and is evidently mistaken for bēn(f), *entreaty*, which latter never has a second n; byrnan figures for beornān as infinitive to barn (bear), burnon, and the Gothic causative gabraunjan (it should be gabrannjan) is given as cognate; a double error, since the neuter brinnan is wanted; genēðian stands for genēðan, and gescy(i)dan for gescy(i)ldan. Thereupon gescy(i)ldan is registered separately. The difference appears to be that the former means *to shield, guard*, and the latter *to shield, protect*.

The editor's manner of operating with Grein's critical apparatus may be shown by a single example: drȳmust (Dan. 37) is a conjecture of Grein for the MS dȳrust, *dearest*, and, according to the analogy of gedrȳmost (Ex. 79), is from gedrēme, *iubilans*. Prof. Hunt gives the adj. gedrȳme in his glossary, but under the separate entry drȳmust he refers simply to dȳre, where we find dȳre, ra, ost (drȳmust). His note to the passage is no clearer; and drȳmust is accordingly a variant of dȳrost!

A feature of the vocabulary is the citation of Gothic cognates, but here, too, mistakes abound, one or two of which have already been mentioned: dæljan

(for dailjan), fader (for fadar), guþa for guþ. In the note to mōdge (Ex. 479) Goth. muns is cited. Why not mōþs? Under brim, *sea*, we find Goth. saivs, but under sæ (it should be sæ) no hint of saivs.

Some of the meanings attached to words are almost incredible. For instance, byrne(f) is rendered *trumpet*; a more honest English word could scarcely be found than burnie, *coat of mail*, and Garnett uses it in his Beowulf translation; clam(m) is rendered *clay, clamp, band*, which are apparently borrowed from Bosworth-Toller; but clām, *clay*, is quite a different word. Cringan, *to cringe, submit*, gives no hint of *sink in death*. How would the editor translate fæge crungon (Ex. 481), for even Thorpe deserts him here and says correctly, *the fated died*. Fēðe-gāst is translated *foot-guest, spirit of death*. Grein printed (Ex. 475) fēðe-gāst, but already in the glossary he gives instead fēðe-gæst, *advena pedester*; so Béow. 1977. The editor hopelessly confuses the two English words *guest* and *ghost*, for his note to the above passage gives us again fēðe-gāst, *hostile visitor, foot guest*.

It will be noticed that the foregoing list of errors stops with the letter g in the glossary. To go further would have been tedious. The word holmwæall must, however, be cited, as it shows incredible handling of the finest passage in the Exodus. The meanings given are *sea-wall, dike*. The editor is evidently thinking of the other kind of sea-wall. The passage is Ex. 467, and the reference is to the wall of water which rose before the affrighted Egyptians in the Red Sea.

In fine, Prof. Hunt's Exodus and Daniel must be pronounced a carelessly edited book, and entirely unsuitable to put into the hands of students who are not sufficiently advanced to correct its mistakes.

H. W.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM.

XXXVII, 1.

1. pp. 1-25. O. Seeck. Studies touching Early Records in Roman History. An examination of the lists of towns in Pliny (N. H. III 68-9) and Dionysius (Ant. Rom. V 61). The list of Pliny contains 51 names, and concludes with the words: *ita ex antiquo Latio LIII populi interiere sine vestigiis*. The list is obviously made up of two parts; it is only the second part, beginning *et cum iis carnem in monte Albano soliti accipere populi*, which S. discusses. In this part—a list of a Latin confederacy—there are apparently 31 names; the two names needed to make up the number 53 must have been lost from the foregoing enumeration. This second part consists of gentile names in alphabetical order. This arrangement suggests at once the conjecture that the list is borrowed from Varro, and the conjecture is confirmed by an examination of the spelling of the names. Varro doubtless copied his list from a very old inscription, gave to the names, so far as he could, the correct spelling of his own time, and then made a list in alphabetical order. In this last mechanical operation, for which, as well as for the final copying of the book, a slave may have been employed ("convict indexing" had not then been heard of), a slight slip occurred: The words *Albani* and *Longani* got separated and thus the sacred number of 30 was unduly increased. The inscription upon which the list must have rested was doubtless very old. It commemorated some public act of the Latin Confederacy, or rather of a Latin Confederacy, for as a list of the members of the Latin Confederacy it would be very surprising: the places named are almost all of them unimportant, half of them are unknown, and the very important names of Tibur, Gabii, Lanuvium, and even Lavinium itself, are missing. The inference is justified by this fact and by other arguments, that various confederacies, each contriving to make up for itself the sacred number of 30 members, existed at different times. The claims of Alba and the claims of Lavinium to the position of metropolis in Latium rested on nothing better than fictions designed to support their hegemony in their respective confederacies. In the list of Dionysius we have again to do with a list, arranged in the order of the Roman alphabet, borrowed from Varro and by him compiled from an inscription. This time it is a list of the members of a Latin confederacy at whose head are the towns of Tusculum and Aricia, and whose chief magistrate is Octavius Mamilius, a Tusculan, with the title of Dictator. The list has, to be sure, only 29 names: the one more which we have the right to expect has been omitted by somebody's fault in copying. The reader is reminded of the list of Latin communities from Cato (Fr. 58, Peter) quoted by Priscian as an example of the form *Ardeatis*. Here the order is not alphabetical, and Tusculum and Aricia lead off; the chief magistrate is a Dictator Latinus, again a Tusculan. Priscian did not continue his quotation beyond the word he needed; but of the eight names given, one

only, Pometia, is missing in Dionysius: Pometia is the name to be supplied then in order to make up the full number of 30. This time the inscription used by Varro and the one used by Cato recorded acts of one and the same period, one and the same confederacy. What was the date of these inscriptions? Not later than B. C. 381, because in that year Tusculum ceased to be independent; not earlier than 382, because Setia did not become a Latin community until that year. The two Dictators are to be assigned to the two years 382 and 381. For the spirit and purposes of the confederacy as hostile to Rome we may well trust Dionysius; but his view of its date rests upon nothing. The date argued for accords well with Livy's account of the years in question. But Livy understood very ill the meaning of the Roman citizenship bestowed upon Tusculum: at that early day that gift was no gift, but rather a bitter punishment—it was nothing more nor less than extinction of the local independence. This, Tusculum, as the head of the confederacy, had merited; other towns were treated with more mercy.

2. pp. 26-34. C. Galland. Arcadius and the *Λεξικὸν τῆς γραμματικῆς* published by Bachmann. The point of the very complicated argument is, that the tract *περὶ τόνων* commonly ascribed to Arcadius cannot with probability be regarded as the work of Theodosius of Alexandria, who was probably the compiler of that particular *γραμματικὴ* (an enlargement of the grammar of Dionysius Thrax) on which the *λεξικόν* in question was based. Further, it appears that the arrangement of the chapters *περὶ χρόνων* and *περὶ πνευμάτων* in the work of Arcadius agrees with the arrangement existing in the *γραμματικὴ* above mentioned, and is probably the original arrangement of Herodian in the twentieth book of the *καθολικὴ προσφῶδια*. If this view be correct, the restoration of that book attempted by Lentz is a failure.

3. pp. 35-49. E. Westerburg. Lucan, Florus, and Pseudo-Victor. In a dissertation published at Breslau in 1874, G. Baier attempted to refute the received opinion that Florus based important parts of his narrative on the *Pharsalia* of Lucan. Baier thought the coincidences sufficiently explained by the undoubted fact that both Lucan and Florus made free use of Livy. Baier is now in his turn refuted (and very thoroughly) by W., who shows from a multitude of passages not only that Florus agrees with Lucan in his account of events, but that he often borrows words and unusual phrases, figures, images, in short, everything that gives characteristic color to his story. It even happens, again and again, that gross mistakes of fact in Florus are due to misunderstandings of Lucan's text or to over-logical inferences from Lucan's unguarded expressions. It is true that Florus used Livy, apparently also that he trusted sometimes to his own memory of his general reading, but all this only in the most careless way. So clear is the relation between Florus and Lucan that W. thinks Lucan may sometimes give useful hints for the restoration of the text of Florus. Accordingly he proposes to read Flor. 95, 26, *dominatio non ex fide sed quia*. See Luc. Ph. I 98. Again, Flor. 98, 30, *praecipitantibus fata*. See Luc. Ph. VII 51. And Flor. 99, 17, *Pompei fusus super cornua erupisset*. See Luc. Ph. VII 365, 505. That the author of the biographies ascribed to Aurelius Victor followed Lucan is made plain by an examination of the account of the decapitation of Pompey. Lucan remarks (Ph. VIII 672) that at that time elegance of workmanship in the headsman's art had not yet been attained

—nondum artis erat caput ense rotare. The paraphrase of this in Aurelius Victor is rather startling: iamque defuncti caput gladio praecisum, quod usque ad ea tempora fuerat ignoratum.

4. pp. 50-3. F. B(ücheler). The Author of the tract *περὶ κόσμον*. Among the papers of Th. Bergk were found a few leaves containing notes of his search for the author of the pseudo-Aristotelian *περὶ κόσμον*. These notes show the general course of the reasoning and the conclusion reached. From internal evidence it is clear that the tract was composed later than the time of Posidonius, though probably not much later. It is also clear that it was composed before the time of Apuleius. Who was the Alexander to whom it was dedicated? Bergk settles upon the son of Herod and Mariamne, and concludes that the author was Nikolaos of Damascus. In a prefatory note F. B. remarks that Bergk, had he lived to put his notes in form for publication, would probably have discussed the differences in style between this and the known works of Nikolaos, and might have stated his reasons for passing by the son of Antony and Cleopatra in the search for the Alexander of the dedication. In another note at the close F. B. calls attention to a quotation from Plato's *Laws* occurring p. 401, a, 24. The author had in mind two passages of Plato (715e and 730c). Some interpolator, not understanding this, continued the quotation from the first passage a little too far. Where we read *ἥς ὁ εὐδαιμονήσσειν μέλλων* in the MSS of Aristotle should be restored *ἥς ὁ γενήσεσθαι μέλλων*.

5. pp. 54-66. O. Ribbeck. Notes on the *Asinaria* of Plautus. The play is briefly characterized; the miserable prologue and the obvious interpolations are cited as proof that it was brought upon the stage again and again. Some of the seeming inconsistencies in the action may be easily explained, others less easily. A lacuna must, in spite of the argument of the most recent editors, be assumed after 495, and not a short one at that. In 829 f. R. sees a fragment of the scene in which Diabolus had played the part of a listener (see 815, 826), not an evidence of a second recension. In 99 f. he restores: *piscari in aere reti iaculo aut venari avem in medio mari*. The dialogue 308 ff. is not to be helped by seeking interpolations; it is none too full as it stands. But a thoroughgoing transposition is necessary. R. writes *tutumst* for *certumst* in 308, and then proposes the following order: 312, 309, 317, 310, 311, 315, 316, 313, 314, 318. For *sic hoc*, 352, he conjectures *sicce*. In 395 *cum venisset* of the MSS is a corruption of *conveni istic*. In 424 f. the hiatus is avoided by the insertion of two needed pronouns: *ianua hac hoc stercus*, and *deici has operas*. In 445 the insertion of *perdere* is too much; it is enough to alter *hem non* into *damnum*. In the dialogue 470 ff. R. advises another transposition as follows: 469, 470, 476, 471, 473 (prefixing *o* before *flagitium*, to help the metre), then *pergin precari pessumo* from 477 with *crura hercle diffringentur* from 474, then 475, 472, then *malum hercle nobis quaeritis* (474) with *quae res? tun libero homini* (477), then 478. In 501 it is impossible to avoid regarding *adnumeravit* as a word of four syllables. In 512 R. writes *lingua pascit*; in 513, *consistit cibi*; in 519, *loquendi totam et tuam*. In 534 he inserts *nulla* after *summast*. The verse 557 is regarded as a fragment of the passage lost after 547. In 592 the simplest course is to write *vale* twice. In 846, the answer of Argyrippus probably began *ergo sume ea quae optas*; the following *volo* is clearly wrong—perhaps *nulla sunt* should be substituted. In 861, *frugi* is probably a gloss for *sanctum*;

the whole speech (860-63) probably interpolated. In 871, *eum etiam* is a corruption of *egregium*. In 875, the true beginning of the verse must be *immo etiam*.

6. pp. 67-82. E. Patzig. The Stories from Nonnos in the Violarium of Eudokia. This is a continuation of the argument by which Pulch (*De Eudociae quod fertur Violario*, Argent. 1880) began the proof that the Violarium was composed north of the Alps about the middle of the sixteenth century. P. has examined the MSS and editions of the commentaries upon Gregory of Nazianzus written by Nonnus, and is able to point out precisely the MS used by the compiler of the Violarium. He is sure the work of compilation was done in Paris. There is no evidence of intention to commit a literary forgery. Nothing more likely than that the use of Eudokia's name was intended as a compliment to the studious ladies of the court of Francis I, for whose use the book may well have been intended. The Paris MS of the Violarium is doubtless in the handwriting of the original compiler. Who this was is not yet known, but several indications tend to point out Petrus Castellanus (Pierre Duchâtel).

7. pp. 83-123. E. Wölfflin. On the Problems of Latin Lexicography. In this article we have a sort of prologue to the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie*. See this Journal, IV 494, where so complete a statement of Wölfflin's ideas and purposes will be found that nothing need be given here beyond the translation of a few characteristic sentences. "Instead of presenting general considerations and precepts . . . we have preferred to persuade and convince by striking examples. We hope the result may be . . . an intelligent perception of the fact that we have before us rich material not yet sufficiently employed, and that what we can make of it and must make of it is no unproductive capital, no heap of dry bones, but that out of it is to come a light illuminating all the branches of classical and Romance philology, and indeed the history of Occidental civilisation in general . . . In the performance of this task, lexicon and historical grammar are hardly to be separated from each other; and, although for the sake of convenience in use an alphabetical arrangement may be preferable, still the articles should contain whatever we have the right to expect in a grammar. If this view of the problem be taken, the time will come for saying, *utinam bonus essem lexicographus*." And in another place: "Under all circumstances we insist upon the demand that an article in a lexicon must have the character of a biography. Indeed this is a self-evident statement, for every word is an organism with a life and an individuality of its own." Among the specimens of lexicographical work given is an interesting account of *volens*; an easy proof that Jerome was not the author of the whole *Vulgata*; the remark that in classical Latin *via recta* is rare and *recta via* common; and a collection of cases of *versa vice*, the modern *vice versa* apparently not occurring in any ancient author. Other words discussed are *actutum*, *etsi*, *toti* (for *omnes*), *persuadere aliquem*, *bene dicere aliquem*, etc., etc. The article is both agreeable and stimulating reading.

8. pp. 124-52. Miscellany. F. Schöll blames the confidence with which various scholars have drawn inferences touching the topography of the Trojan plain from Z 4. He reminds us that the reading of that verse as printed in our editions (*μεσσηγὺς Σιμύεντος ἰδὲ Ζάνθοιο βοάων*) is far from certain, and then

argues very strongly that this form of the verse is an invention of Aristarchus, the true reading being μεσσηγὺς ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρον καὶ στομαλίνης. In the same book S. thinks the contradictory statements about the dwelling of Hector (vv. 242 ff.) too thoroughly irreconcilable to permit belief in the integrity of an original text. The suspicion that vv. 243-250 are an interpolation is confirmed by the difficulty in the interpretation of εἰσάγουσα, 252—a difficulty which wholly disappears with the removal of the spurious verses.

Th. Koch emends the only existing fragment of the Artemis of Ehippos, writing: παρ' Ἀλεξάνδρον δ' ἐκ Θετταλίας | κολλικοφάγον κρίβανος ἄρτων. There is a political allusion in the lines: Alexander of Pherai had cheated the Athenians into an alliance for his own purposes by making great promises; had continued to keep their hopes alive as long as he could make use of them; but had done them no more substantial service than to send a κρίβανος ἄρτων. The κρίβανος was a big jar in which bread and meats might be put for baking; the κόλλιξ a coarse sort of loaf eaten by slaves, by Boeotian farmers, and by Thessalian serfs.

H. Gloel. Notes on Plato's Philebus. Several emendations, all easy, all sensible, all, in the reviewer's opinion, right. 23B, ἐπὶ τε τὰ δευτερεῖα—26D, τό γε πέρας οὔτε πολλὰ οὐκ εἶχεν—32C, τὸ μὲν πρὸ τῶν ἡδέων ἐλπιζομένων ἡδὴ—32E, ὥς εἴπερ ὄντως ἐστὶ τῶν λεγομένων διαφθειρομένων μὲν—34C, ἀναμνήσεις πον λέγομεν, striking out καὶ μνήμας—47C, περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰ ψυχὴ σώματι.

M. Schanz corrects the careless description of the Paris MS of Alkiphron given in Seiler's edition.

G. Goetz argues against the authority of the Wolfenbüttel MS of Tibullus, to which Bährens ascribes so high a value. In the light of a fresh collation made by Löwe it appears that Bährens rests his view upon mistaken readings of the MS. G. holds that its peculiarities are due partly to conjecture, partly to interpolation from some mediaeval collection of excerpts in which liberties had been taken with the text.

E. Rohde calls attention to the excellence of a Brussels MS of the philosophical writings of Apuleius, which has been neglected hitherto. He also remarks that the Cambridge MS, of which the younger Gronov made a collation, deserves a new examination.

F. Blass shows that the only example of *quod* with subj. as a form of indirect quotation earlier than Cicero's letters must be stricken from the grammars. The example in question is Plaut. Asin. 52. The words *equidem scio iam* are parenthetical; the clause with *quod* is parallel with the similar clause in 48, that is, it is a continuation of the interrupted sentence *quor postremo filio suscenseam*.

XXXVII, 2.

1. pp. 153-205. G. F. Unger. Treaties between Rome and Carthage. The most important point discussed is the date of the earliest treaty. In the light of the facts of Carthaginian history it is impossible that the date given by Polybius (B. C. 498) can be right: the treaty was made B. C. 340.

2. pp. 206-25. A. Ludwich. The Poetry of Eudokia, Wife of Theodosius II. "In der gesammten epischen Litteratur der Griechen giebt es wohl nur einen Dichter, der in ähnlicher Weise gegen den guten Geschmack gefrevelt

hat, und das ist der siebenhundert Jahre jüngere Schulmeister Johannes Tzetzes." A final footnote calls attention to the very different judgment of Gregorovius, in his recent biography of the empress.

3. pp. 226-40. F. Bücheler. Notes on the Odes of Horace. II 1, 38, *neniae* is a chosen word—a proof that Horace understood the droning monotony of the preceding stanza as well as any of his critics, and meant thereby to express his feeling for the perpetual sameness of slaughter in the Civil Wars. II 2, 11-12 prove that in Horace's time a Carthaginian population could still be distinguished in Southern Spain. As we know that the ode is addressed to a possessor of mines, and as we elsewhere find Phoenicians employed by Romans in the working of mines, it may be that precisely this employment kept Carthaginian laborers as a distinct people in Spain longer than might have been expected, and that the mines of Salustius suggested an allusion hardly justified by the importance of Spanish Carthage. II 4, 11, *leviora* is by no means an awkward substitute for *faciliora*; it is the one word adequate for the combination with *tolli*. The removal of Hector is a taking away of part of the burden to be lifted. Furthermore, *ademptus* is by no means identical with *interemptus* or *peremptus*. II 6, 10-12: there is a sportive meaning hidden in these lines. The *pellitae oves* occur naturally to the old gentleman who likes to be taken care of (see Plaut. Merc. 524 ff. for the comparison); and the name Phalanthos, being interpreted, means *praecanus*: Horace is making a jest of his own gray hairs. See the story told by Pausanias (X 10, 7) of the gentle care Phalanthos received from his wife. II 6, 18-20: the figure gives to Aulon a perfectly human feeling: he is a friend of Bacchus, but without jealousy for a still nearer friend. II 7, 22: why *ciboria*? Because *ciboria* are Egyptian vessels. The verses mean: "Fill the cups, which remind you of your service under Antony and Cleopatra, with the native wine of Italy, which can make you forget the past." II 8, 2: it is doubtful whether *Barine* (to be connected with *Barium*) or *Varine* should be written. But if the word be Italian, it may be safer to connect it with the Latin names *Varus*, *Varinus*, *Varinius*. Genuine Latin names of libertinae are often found with Greek inflections in inscriptions; indeed the hybrid form may here be intended as a mark of servile birth—a free-born Roman woman must have been called Varina (*Barina*). II 9, 1: the life of nature is compared with the life of man, *εὐδία τε καὶ χεῖμῶνες*, so also joy and sorrow. The *imbres* are the counterpart of the *fletus* for which the poet brings his consolation. But in *hispidos* we must see an epithet appropriate rather to the mourner's own condition than to the *agros* with which it is connected. The mythical parallels cited make it probable that Valgius had lost a son, not a *puer delicatus*. These mythical parallels had probably been extensively used in *consolationes* (cf. Cic. Tusc. I 93 and Plut. ad Apoll. 24). In general it is impossible to trace the philosophic ingredients of the Odes of Horace; but in II 16, 7 the *venale* (and perhaps more) comes from a source used by Plutarch in his *περὶ ἡσυχίας* (Stob. Flor. 58, 14.) II 11 is generally misunderstood. The peculiar mixture of luxury and simplicity is studied; Hirpinus is more than rich enough, if he will but use his riches. He seems something such a person as a modern banker (cf. Epist. I 16). It is incredible that Horace could mix in bits of city life with an idyll of the country: the scene is probably the park of Hirpinus near Rome. The *navis* is of a

common sort, but the wine is of the finest; no care is taken in selecting the singing-woman, whose hair is very simply dressed; but the lyre, the thing the old gentlemen really care for, is of ivory. II 14: Postumus is not the name of a real person—that is clear from the anadiplosis in v. 1, and from the fact that the spendthrift *heres* is called *dignior* without qualification. Postumus is only the average man of wealth and standing. II 15, 7: in the old days of frugality the broad spaces between the olive trees were planted with corn; now nothing better than fine odors comes from the land. *Intonsi Catonsi*, v. 11, is a hinted jeer at the men who are so fine they must even shear their trees. II 16, 31 f., *et mihi forsan tibi quod negarit porriget hora*. So must the lines be written. Even granting that a transposition of the pronouns would make the words more polite, it would wholly distort their sense, which is: "You have many advantages over me, but still the coming hour may refuse you some delight which it will give to me." II 16, 39: there is a play upon words in *Parca non mendax*, "stingy and true to her name," cf. *animae magnae prodigum Paulum*, I 12, 37 f. II 19, 30: the *cornu* is a drinking-horn; Cerberus takes the place in the picture which is given to a Pan or to a panther on many vases and wall-paintings. On this point B. gives a long note composed by R. Kekulé. II 20, 6, *quem vocas* is pretty much the equivalent of *cliens tuus*. Cf. *cluere* and *vocare*, Lucr. I 480 f. But the word *dilecte* modifies the definition of Horace's relation to Maecenas. Throughout the following transformation the poet continues to be Horace still; the terms chosen for the description are all almost as suitable for a man getting old as for the swan. In v. 23 *clamorem* is technically used for the *conclamatio* immediately after death. Cf. Verg. Aen. IV 565, 674.

4. pp. 241-51. H. van Herwerden. Demosthenica. Conjectural corrections of about sixty passages.

5. pp. 252-60. F. Hanssen. On the Word-Ictus in Greek. At first blush, at least, the simplicity and consistency of the theory laid down in this paper are very captivating. I can do no more here than to give a summary of the doctrine proposed, and to commend the article earnestly to the attention of readers of this Journal. The word-ictus (force of utterance) is something different from, but not wholly independent of, the grammatical accent (pitch). The word-ictus in Greek is identical with what is called accent in Latin. And the rule for the Greek ictus bears a close analogy with the rule for Latin accent. In Greek, if the ultima is long (by nature or position), it has the ictus; if the ultima is short, the penult has the ictus. The grammatical accent may be on the ictus syllable (*ἐρῶ*), or on the preceding syllable (*ἀνθρώπου*), or on the following syllable (*ποταμός*). "Damit ist an Stelle des Dreisilbengesetzes mit seinen unklaren Ergänzungen eine genügende und einheitliche Bestimmung über die möglichen Stellungen des Accentus gegeben." The distinction of acute and circumflex is of more recent origin than the law stated and depends on wholly different conditions. The law explains the difference of accent between *ἐριβῶλαξ* and *ἐριβῶλος*. An enclitic shares the accent of the preceding word whenever that is possible. This is possible when the preceding word has its accent on the ultima and the enclitic begins with the ictus-syllable. Otherwise the enclitic throws back its accent, if possible, upon the syllable next preceding its own ictus. So in *ἡμῶν, σῶμά τι*. But the accent thus thrown

back must not fall upon an ictus-syllable (e. g. *ἀνθρώπου τινος* is impossible because the ultima of *ἀνθρώπου* has the ictus). To avoid that, the accent will stand upon the syllable following the ictus of the enclitic (*κῆρυξ ἐστίν*), or will disappear wholly (*γνώμη τις*), according to the necessities of the case.¹ An exception to these rules occurs in cases like *λόγος τις*: probably the immediate succession of two syllables with the acute was unpleasant to the ear. But when the word before the enclitic has a trochaic ending, the rule is not clear: it was held doubtful in antiquity whether to write *ἄνδρα μοι* or *ἄνδρά μοι*: the intervention of two consonant sounds between the vowels of *ἄνδρα* diminished the unpleasant effect of the succession of acute accents. It is a rule for proclitics as well as for enclitics that the accent, if it cannot precede the ictus-syllable, must follow it or be lost. So *ἐπὶ γνώμη*, as well as *γνώμη τινός*. In *τινὲς λέγουσιν*, it is probably right to regard *τινὲς* as a proclitic. The word-ictus in historical times remains fixed upon the syllable upon which it was originally established without regard to changes in the word. It is not affected by the combination of words into sentences. A variety of details discussed by H. cannot be noticed here.

6. pp. 261-73. K. Dziatzko. On the Aulularia of Plautus. The confusion touching the two slaves named Strobilus still needs to be explained. Strobilus I is the slave of Megadorus; Strobilus II, of Lyconides. From several passages it appears that Lyconides and his mother live in the same house with Megadorus (133, 694, 727). Shall we assume that one and the same Strobilus serves both masters? No. Strobilus II never speaks of Megadorus as his *eris* (see 604 and especially 823 f.). Further, there are passages which would indicate that Eunomia did *not* live with Megadorus (144, 605). Probably in the Greek original the dwellings were entirely separate; but Plautus in his translation brought the two lovers under one roof with a view to heighten the comic effect, but did not take the necessary pains to change all the passages inconsistent with his plan. This carelessness is no more serious than has been proved against the far more careful Terence (R. M. XXXI 374 ff.) What then of Strobilus? Probably the name Pythodocus originally belonged to Strobilus I. It may be that some reviser of the play thought to outdo Plautus in heightening the comic confusion by making one name serve for both slaves; but the reviser in his turn forgot to change the heading of Act II, Sc. 7. Wherever the name *Strobilus* occurs in the text, *Pythodocus* can be substituted without injury to the metre. In 330-331 the words *hercle*—*habent* must be

¹ 'Besonders wichtig,' says Hanssen, 'ist das letzte Beispiel, dessen Betonung bisher unverständlich war.' The accentuation of *κῆρυξ* and *φοῖνιξ* is due to the express statements of the grammarians, who give the rule that 'ι and υ are never long by nature before ξ in hypermonosyllabic nouns.' See Götting, Acc. d. G. S. 254; Chandler, Gr. Acc.² p. 176. Hanssen's assumption of ictus on the last syllable, when long by nature or position, explains the anomaly and shows why *κῆρυξ ἐστίν* is not accentuated like *σώμα ἐστίν*. As to the translation of pitch into stress, ancient Greek accent into modern Greek accent, Hanssen seems inclined to put that late; see his interesting study in Rhein. Mus. XXXVIII 2, to be reported hereafter. That the pitch accent is not dead in corners of Greece would appear from such observations as the following, taken from an article by J. Theodore Bent in Macmillan's Magazine, August, 1883: 'Their language' [he is speaking of the villages of Chios] 'is more primitive, with many Ionic peculiarities; they pronounce the omega distinctly, saying *ἄνθρωπος*, not as the modern Greeks do, according to accent and ignoring the long *ο*, but with a sort of musical cadence in it, placing an accent on both the first syllables'—doubtless pitch on one, ictus on the other.—B. L. G.

given to Congrio. In 328 the fat lamb must have been assigned to Anthrax and the other lamb must have been mentioned—something like this: *cape*. AN. *hunc exilem exili dare licet*. STR. *Tu Congrio*. In 348 f. D. proposes to read *quippe qui ibi quod*. In 721, *pessume orbatus*.

7. pp. 274-91. J. Klein. Critical remarks on the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. A series of emendations.

8. pp. 292-320. Miscellany. Th. Koch amends two or three passages from Greek poets. He thinks it is hard not to write satire when emendations like some of those proposed by Wilamowitz for the comic fragments are praised by other people as well as by their author. We may be well persuaded—as indeed candid scholars must be—of the greatness and importance of Wilamowitz's work without being very angry at Koch when he says: "in dem alten Athen orakelte man nicht so wie heute in Kydathen und verstand was man zu sagen beabsichtigte erheblich schlichter, deutlicher, anmuthiger, mit einem Worte hellenischer auszudrücken." K. fears that in his wrath at certain blunders he may have been a little too short in his note added at the end Cratin. 321 in his new edition of the Comic Fragments. Not that Wilamowitz was right in proposing *Πελασγικὸν ἄργον ἐμβατεύων*—that would be too prosaic; but *ἀργὸς ἐμβατεύων* may be right. K. returns to the fragment discussed by him R. M. XXXV 277, and now writes *ἀέρα* instead of *οὐρανόν* in v. 14. In Alcaeus 5, 2 he writes *κορύφαις ἐν αἵπαις*.

F. Bücheler and J. Asbach return to the tract *περὶ κόσμον* and Bergk's note upon it in the preceding number. Diels has reminded B. that Victorius (*Variae Lectiones*, Florence, 1532, p. 305) anticipated Bergk's ascription of the work to Nikolaos. Asbach pays Bücheler a very practical sort of compliment in quoting Sophronios (Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* IV, p. ii): *Νικόλαος ὁ φιλόσοφος Ἡρόδου παιδευτὴς καὶ παῖδων τῶν Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας διδάσκαλος*.

Next comes a note on Strabo VII, p. 291, again from the papers of Th. Bergk.

K. Fuhr prints part of a letter from Ch. Graux, declaring that there is no doubt the Laurentianus of Plutarch was written in the year 997.

J. Sommerbrodt gives considerable collations from an important manuscript (hitherto unknown) of Lucian in Modena, and complains bitterly of the removal of the library there to make room for a military school.

O. Crusius makes it probable that the story of the death of Aeschylus is only a parody (probably of comic origin) of the prophecy in Aesch. Fr. 270 (269).

R. Meister gives up his earlier objections to the Boeotian form *εἰνιξα* (Att. *ἦνεγκα*).

G. Busolt shows by a skillful combination that Ephoros assumed the spring of 459 B. C. as the date of the removal of the treasure from Delos to Athens. But he admits a doubt whether this date is the true one; possibly the removal took place after the failure of the Egyptian expedition.

H. Deiter gives notes of a collation of the Vossianus 86 of Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, and points out that the value of this MS is greater than has been assumed.

W. Schmitz contributes brief remarks on Varro and the *Notae Tironianae*. In the note *Tricipitinus Symphronius* (p. 191) he finds a second title for Varro's

Τρικάρπος. Gruter, p. 153, 2, he would read *Herbita*, *Herbitanus*; p. 156, 2, *enchyma*, or the vulgar *enchoma*, *encoma*; p. 157, 2, *orchitopoles* (dealer in olives).

A. Mau declines once more to adopt Duhn's view concerning the place where the Sarnus anciently entered the bay.

J. H. WHEELER.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. FLECKEISEN und MASIVS. 1882.

I.

1. pp. 1-18. Moritz Schmidt, of Jena, *Metrisches zu Sophokles*. The passages treated are the commatic parodoi, Oed. Col. 117-253, and Phil. 135-218, 1081-1217.

2. p. 18. E. Weissenborn, of Mühlhausen, notes the division of the *Odyssey* by "hauptmomente" into six parts of four books each.

3. pp. 19-32. F. Schultz, of Charlottenburg, gives a new interpretation of the second mathematical passage in Plat. Men. (86e f.). S. agrees with Benecke (Ueber die geometrische hypothesis in Plat. Men., Elbing, 1867) that *χωρίον* refers to the square drawn before (82e), and that *τρίγωνον* should be taken predicatively. He differs with B. in taking the triangle as right-scalene formed by the diagonal and two sides of the rectangle made by doubling the given square. A clear translation of the entire passage is given.

4. pp. 33-8. R. Schubert, of Königsberg, reviews F. Gebhard's dissertation, *De Plutarchi in Demosthenis vita fontibus ac fide*, Munich, 1880. The work is commended in general. The investigation is very difficult on account of the variety and obscurity of the sources. Gebhard rightly holds that Plutarch made use of a common stock of stories, and refers chapters 4, 9 and 12 to other sources on insufficient evidence. He gives Satyros too large a share in the common stock, and is in error in supposing that Plutarch consulted the scholia on the speeches of Dem. What G. says about the incidental sources is very valuable. The hypothesis that Plutarch's "humanitas" prevented him from saying anything bad about his characters unless he had at least two authorities has been verified only in his life of Demosthenes.

5. pp. 38-40. R. Schubert, of Königsberg, in *Lysias XII*, §57, proposes *φαντων* (= τῶν αὐτῶν) for *τούτων*. N. Wecklein, of Bamberg, in *Lys. XIII*, §50, strikes out ΓΡΑΦΑΙ and ΨΗΦΙΣΜΑΤΑ. The same writer, in *XIII*, §86 and 87, tries to get rid of the difficulty by putting in *ὅς* between *εἰη* and *τινα*, and inserting *πατάξας* after *ξύλῳ*.

6. pp. 41-5. J. H. C. Schubart, of Kassel, defends Pausanias against U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf (*Aus Kydathen*, Berlin, 1880).

7. pp. 46-50. Theodore Plüss, of Basel, gives a rhetorico-lyric interpretation of Aen. VI 580-627.

8. p. 50. R. Dressler, of Bautzen, in *Stob. Anthol. I* 49, shows the true reading to be *Μοσχίωνος: Βέλτιον ὀλιγάκις ὁμολογοῦντα κατορθοῦν σωφρονεῖν πολλάκις ἢ ὀλιγάκις ἀμαρτανεῖν λέγοντα πλημμελεῖν πολλάκις*.

9. pp. 51-63. W. Studemund, of Straszburg, adds to corrections of the Terentian scholia published in *Jahrbücher* for 1868 (p. 546 fol.) the results of

a day's work in collating the Codex Bembinus at Rome in 1879. Umpfenbach first published these scholia in full (Hermes, II 337-402), and Studemund confines himself to those copied by U. from the Andria, those from the Eunuchus which U. marks as from "the earlier hand," and a few others taken at random. A good example is the scholion on Eun. I 1, 9 and 10, which U. writes: Omnia ista verba de iudicio sunt 'Actum' quod dixit, definitionem negotii significat. Sic et solutionem 'peristi,' quasi sententiam quoniam (A has it thus or quondam) suscepisti (A has suscipisti). The words explained by the scholion read *actumst, ilicet, peristi*, and the sense is much better if we read with A: 'actum' quod dixit, definitionem negotii significat, 'ilicet' solutionem, 'peristi,' etc.

10. pp. 63-4. E. Goebel, of Fulda, in Hor. Sat. I 9, 14-16, proposes a new interpretation turning on the meaning of *abire*, which G. regards as equivalent to *hinc abire* simply, i. e. not from the speaker, but from the place (cf. Aen. IV 281). Iter should be understood with *tenebo*, if *persequar* be retained; but it is better to read (with Bentley) *prosequar*.

11. pp. 65-75. J. Cäsar, of Marburg, reviews F. Vogel's dissertation, De Hegesippo, qui dicitur, Josephi interprete, Erlangen, 1880. The objections raised by Vogel against the Ambrosian authorship of the translation are shown to have very slight foundation.

12. p. 75. F. Susemihl, of Greifswald, controverts the inference drawn by Rohde from Plat. Theaet. 175^{ab} (Jahr. 1881, 321-6, in Am. Jour. of Phil. III 487), and accepted by Dittenberger (Herm. XVI 342 fol.), that the date of the Theaetetus should be placed later than 374.

13. pp. 76-9. H. Berger, in his geographische Fragmente des Eratosthenes, Leipzig, 1880, a work of much importance in the history of geography, proposes that the chorographia of Pomponius Mela be used in filling out the details of Eratosthenes's coast-line of western Europe. Carl Frick, of Höxter, objects to this use of Mela on the ground that the chorographia is altogether untrustworthy.

14. pp. 79-80. F. Luterbacher, of Burgdorf, emends O. Jahn's edition of Julius Obsequens, c. 66 [125], in three places.

II.

15. pp. 81-90. E. Rohde, of Tübingen, answers K. Köstlin's objections (published in the appendix to Schweigler's Hist. Greek Philos. 1882, p. 460 fol.) to the date which R. proposes and defends for the composition of the Theaetetus in Jahr. 1881, pp. 321-6 (see Am. Jour. of Phil. III 487). In a postscript R. replies to Susemihl's criticism given above (see 12).

16. pp. 91-4. N. Wecklein, of Bamberg, on Plato's Gorgias. The paper is divided into three parts. The first part treats the vexed question of the main topic of the dialogue. Wecklein finds this implied in 492^d, "What is the true end of human life?" The answer is given by Sokrates in 506^e ff. as *σωφροσύνη*. The introduction of the dialogue with a definition of rhetoric is explained by the fact that the Greeks regarded statesmanship as the highest form of activity, and the statesman was first of all a *ῥήτωρ*. The second part of the paper relates to the place at which the dialogue was held. Wecklein decides in

favor of a gymnasium, in spite of the apparent allusion to Kallikles's house in 447c. The third part contains textual criticisms and emendations, about a dozen in all. *E. g.* in 451b ἡ λογιστικὴ ἔχει is an interpolation. In 492e Plato must have written τυγχάνη τιμωρίας, not τ. δίκης.

17. pp. 94-6. F. L. Lentz, of Königsberg, in Theocritus 13, 61, criticises the passage as given in Fritzsche-Hiller. The remedy is found in G. Hermann's Opusc. VIII 339. 'Οπ' has dropped out before ἀπόπροθι, and a verse, giving the proper alternation in the songs of the shepherds, has been lost after δαῖτα. Lentz thinks that 9, 30 belongs after 10, 20 with the slight change in reading of μή ποκ' for μηκέτ'. L. in Euripides Iph. Taur. 838 proposes an emendation, and in Rhesos 973 defends the traditional ὅστε against Madvig's reading ὥς, ὅς.

18. pp. 97-111. Hermann Peter, of Meiszen, reviews the second division of Arnold Schaefer's sketch of the sources of Greek and Roman history, Leipzig, 1881. This division treats of the period of Roman rule. It merits the praise which has been given to it. After some valuable introductory matter on "general bibliography" and the "auxiliary sciences," the historiography proper is given under six heads: I. From the earliest time to the war of Hannibal, 218 B. C., pp. 5-10; II. From the war of Hannibal to the tribunate of Ti. Sem. Gracchus, 218-133 B. C., pp. 11-30; III. To the end of the Civil War, 133-30 B. C., pp. 30-73; IV. From the reign of Augustus to the close of Trajan's reign, 30 B. C. to 117 A. D., pp. 73-125; V. From Hadrian's time to the partition of the empire by Theodosius, 117-395 A. D., pp. 125-170; and VI. From the death of Theodosius to the death of Justinian, 395-565 A. D., pp. 171-96. All this is given with appropriate subdivisions under the different periods, and in such a way that the Roman and Greek historians and the auxiliary authorities are treated in detail in proper order. The historiography of the VIth period is very valuable, but might better have been put in the form of an appendix to the Vth. The same is true of the Christian writers (and their opponents) of the Vth period. The distinctively Roman writers end with Ammian. Marcell., Dion Cass., etc.

19. pp. 111-12. E. Hoffman, of Vienna, in Cic. De Or. 36, 124, proposes *denebitur* (from an assumed *de-nere*) for *tenebitur*, and conjectures after *explicatae*, *divisiones clarae et dilucidae* (Cod. Einsid. has *explicatae dilucide*, *divisimus clare*, *tum etiam*, etc.).

20. pp. 113-22. M. P. C. Schmidt, of Berlin, on the geographical works of Polybios. Recent writers have attributed three separate geographical and astronomical works to Polybios. Two of these, "De zonis et polis mundi," and "Periplus orae Libycae," are wholly imaginary, and the existence of even the third, "Περὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν ἰσημερινὸν οἰκήσεως," depends on a single citation by Geminus, which does not necessarily imply an independent work. These works should be stricken out of the list of Polybios's writings, and the geographical and astronomical matter quoted from P. referred to the history, especially bk. XXXIV, which is devoted to geography.

21. pp. 123-31. E. Wagner, of Königsberg, reviews and severely criticises Martialis Epigram. Liber I, ed. J. Flach, Tübingen, 1881.

22. pp. 131-2. W. Gilbert, of Dresden, shows that *libra argenti* and *selibra argenti* in Martial, II 44, II 76, I 99, 15, etc., mean *silverware*, not money or bullion.

23. pp. 133-41. C. Meiser, of Munich, on MSS of Tacitus. Meiser is preparing an edition of Tacitus, and has spent two months in collating the Medicean (M) and the other Florentine MSS (a and b). His summary of results promises well for his book. Many mistakes have been overlooked by preceding collators of M, and b is an almost untouched mine of wealth. It is quite remarkable that many of the most brilliant emendations of recent scholars have been anticipated in this MS (b); a, Meiser finds to be of little worth.

24. pp. 141-3. H. Schutze, of Potsdam, proposes six emendations to Tac. Ann.

25. pp. 143-4. Carl Jacoby, of Dantzig, reinforces the conclusion already reached by Lachmann, Haupt and others, that Catullus, c. 68, should not be divided. He wishes to emend l. 118 so as to read thus: *qui te unum comitem ferre jugum docuit*.

O. H. COOPER.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, VII 2-4.¹

No. 2. April.

1. pp. 113-31. Interrogative sentences in indirect discourse in Latin, by O. Riemann. The author discusses briefly the statements of the grammars and the views of several scholars, and then enters into a systematic investigation, the results of which he sums up as follows: 1. The rule that in indirect discourse rhetorical questions take the infinitive and real questions the subjunctive, does not seem to be accurate. 2. To establish a rule it is necessary to distinguish real from rhetorical questions, but we must also distinguish several categories of the latter questions. 3. Questions which, in direct discourse, would be in the third or the first person, may *always* take the infinitive in indirect discourse. The subjunctive, however, is used: a) *occasionally* in sentences containing a real question; b) *frequently* in rhetorical questions which imply the opinion on the part of the speaker that his question cannot be satisfactorily answered (as "what are you afraid of?" addressed to persons who fear without sufficient cause); c) *rarely* in other cases. 4. Questions which, in direct discourse, would be in the second person, take, in indirect discourse, sometimes the subjunctive, sometimes the infinitive. They *always* take the subjunctive in the case mentioned above, 3 b; perhaps also when the question is real, but examples are wanting; in every other case the infinitive predominates, the subjunctive being used only when the verb in the interrogative sentence is one of *believing* or *thinking*, in which case the infinitive cannot be employed.

2. p. 131. Max Bonnet suppresses the period after "legatum" in Caes. B. G. I 47, 2, and puts a semicolon before "intra" and a period before "cuius rei" in VI 21, 4.

3. p. 132. "Y." proposes λογιστήν for τοκιστήν in Pseudo-Plat. Alcib. II 149E, and in Apoll. Rhod. II 772 he proposes ἄχος δ' ἐλ' ἐφ' Ἡρακλῆι.

4. p. 132. In Plaut. Rud. 12, for "adiuuat" L. Havet proposes "adiuuat."

5. pp. 133-39. On the meaning of certain Greek particles, by "Y." The author sets out with the statement that "chaque mot grec a un sens et n'en a

¹ See Am. Journ. Phil. IV 230.

qu'un," a piece of information which would delight many a schoolboy; but then "autre chose est la signification d'un mot qui est une, autre chose les emplois ou les acceptions de ce mot, qui varient nécessairement à l'infini." The meaning of *τοίνυν* is "*maintenant* (formule de transition)," although it is often legitimate to employ a more specific particle in translating. On finding that E. Rosenberg has written an article on *τοίνυν*, "Y" says, "Je n'ai pas lu ni ne lirai pas sans doute cet article, mon opinion étant faite sur le sujet qui y est traité." He then defines and discusses *οὖν*, dans l'état des choses; *ἄν*, le cas échéant; *γάρ*, introduces an explanation (*car*, à savoir); *ὅγ*, demonstrative, something like *voilà*; *καὶ*, even when conjunctive, is not French *et* pure and simple; *μέν*, without *δέ* the same as with *δέ*; *ἄρα*, est-ce que; *ἄρα*, donc; *ἵνα*, an acc. sing. which is to *τίνα* as *ὅτε* to *τότε*, probably has two uses, *où* and *à fin que*, but this results from the fact that *ἵνα* in one sense answers the question *τίνα* (*τρόπον*), and in the other, *τίνα* (*τόπον*); *ἀλλά*, marks a transition to a different series of ideas and is stronger than *δέ*; *ἔτι*, encore (in both senses, *i. e.* "acceptions"); *ἐπεὶ*, postquam; *ἄγαν*, λίαν, nimis, nimium; *πάλιν*, retro; *ἰσως*, également. Of course this brief résumé does not do full justice to the article.

6. p. 139. Σ. P. amends two scholia on Juvenal.

7. pp. 140-41. Biography of ANATOLE BOUCHERIE, by "T." M. Boucherie was born in 1831, and died at Montpellier, April 3, 1883. He was a self-made scholar, and devoted himself more especially to the Romance languages, but made important contributions also to classical philology. At the time of his death he was a member of the Faculty of Letters at Montpellier.

8. pp. 142-44. Book-notices, by E. C.

9. *Revue des Revues*, VII, pp. 1-112; Germany (begun).

No. 3. July.

1. pp. 145-63. *Processus consularis*, by Camille Jullian. The *processus consularis* was the triumphal march or procession of the consul from his house to the Capitol on the day of his entrance into office. The technical term by which it was designated was simply *procedere*. In official language the word seems to have been exclusively so used; there is no mention of a *processus* on the part of censors, praetors, aediles. This formality continued to be observed down to a very late period. The numerous ceremonies attending the inauguration of a consul were not a part of the *processus*; the latter began with the departure of the consul from his house, and ended with his arrival on the Capitol. M. Jullian gives the details of the procession and traces its history, supporting his views with numerous quotations, and explaining why, although it existed throughout the republican period, it is specially mentioned only by writers of the empire. The bulk of the article is an analysis and discussion of Claudian's *De quarto consulatu Honorii* (he changes *quarto* to *tertio*), showing that this poem is a description of the *processus consularis*. The ceremony in later days of course could take place away from Rome. It is traced down to the sixth century both in the East and in the West.

2. pp. 164-69. Interrogative sentences in indirect discourse in Latin, by O. Riemann. The author, having had his attention directed to a work of Kraz

on the same subject, writes this article as a supplement to the one reported above (*Rev. de Phil.* VII 2, pp. 113-31). He classifies according to his theory the additional examples which he finds in Kraz's work, and defends his own views where they are not in accord with those of the German scholar. The difference between the results arrived at by the two authors is due mainly to the fact that they do not have the same opinion as to what constitutes a rhetorical question. Riemann accuses Kraz of approaching the subject with an *a priori* theory which he tries to make the examples sustain.

3. p. 169. In *Cic. de Fin.* II 24, 78, É. Thomas proposes to substitute "prodesse" for "esse" in the clause "esse enim, nisi eris, non potest."

4. pp. 170-73. "Récréations d'un vieux Normalien," Le V. N. 1. In *Cic. pro Arch.* III 6, for "summo honore," read "summo hoc honore," so that *quod . . . colebant* may have something to define. 2. *Ib.*, *ib.* 14, a lacuna suspected after "exemplorum vetustas." 3. *Ib.* VII 15, instead of "Atque" read "Atqui." 4. *Ib.* IX 20, read "repudiemus." 5. *Ib.* IX 21, instead of "Nostra semper" read "Nostrum semper." 6. *Ib.* X 23, instead of "quod" read "quid, quod . . . ?" 7. *Ib.* X 25, suppress "malus." 8. *Senec. Dialog.* I, criticism of some of Van der Vliet's conjectures published in the *Rev. de Phil.* VII, p. 61.

5. pp. 173-75. In *Aristoph. Equit.* 1360, Ch. Cucuel proposes to read *ταύτη* (for *ταύτην*) *τὴν δίκην*, on the ground that *καταγγινώσκειν* means merely *decide a case*.

6. pp. 176-87. *Varroniana*, by Louis Havet. Emendation and discussion of fifteen passages. The article merits the attention of specialists.

7. pp. 188-92. Book-notices, by Albert Martin, E. C., and others.

8. *Revue des Revues*, pp. 113-208. Germany (completed); Austria (begun).

No. 4. December.

1. pp. 193-96. *Varroniana*, by Louis Havet. Continuation of the article mentioned above (No. 3, pp. 176-87).

2. p. 196. Three notes on *Afranius*, by L. H. In 369 (Ribbeck, 2d ed.) "propositis" has grown out of "pro possit is," in which "pro possit" is a gloss on "pote sit" which should be restored instead of "potest."

3. pp. 197-202. *Glossematica*, by Gustav Loewe. Emendation and discussion of a considerable number of glosses from various sources.

4. p. 202. A. Jacob makes a slight correction in the date of "Additional MS 27,359," plate 203, of the publications of the Palaeographical Society.

5. p. 203. In *Cic. de Orat.* II 52, 209, Max Bonnet proposes to read "quae si inflammandast maxime, dicendum est," etc.

6. p. 203. In *Cic. Verr.* v. 43, 113, E. Thomas proposes "extinguere rem" instead of "nos extinguere."

7. pp. 204-8. Book-notices, by E. C. and A. J.

8. *Revue des Revues*, pp. 209-369. Austria (completed), Belgium, Denmark, United States, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Holland, Russia. Errata. Table of Contents.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN.¹ Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING. V Band. Heilbronn, 1882.

I.—The most considerable paper of the volume is that with which it opens, a study by H. M. Regel, bearing the title *On George Chapman's Translation of Homer*. The first instalment occupies pp. 1-55, and the second, which will be touched upon in its proper place, pp. 295-356. An introduction is devoted to a survey of the Elizabethan literature of translation, a bibliographical account of the successive editions of Chapman, and a list of the chief English versions of Homer. After these prefatory remarks, the author enters upon a consideration of Chapman's version in its relation to the original. This leads him at once to the vexed question of the English hexameter, against whose fitness as a medium for the translation of Homer he at last pronounces. The fourteen-syllabled line of Chapman's *Iliad* is then compared with the heroic couplet employed in rendering the *Odyssey*, and the superiority of the latter affirmed. Rime, however, interrupts the easy flow of Homeric narrative, and obliges the translator to become a paraphrast, by no means a disagreeable necessity to Chapman, who, above all things else, was a poet. Chapman's version is, in the main, correct; when he errs, it is sometimes because he is misled by Spon-danus and the other commentators upon whom he depended, and sometimes because he worked in too much haste. Now he misunderstands a single word, and now a whole sentence, but his blunders are chiefly in the matter of proper names. Chapman's general faithfulness having been established, inquiry is made regarding his faithfulness in detail. He does not, like Voss, translate line for line, still less, like Wolf in his celebrated *tour de force*, foot for foot. His inaccuracies consist in the neglect of Homeric particles, in the tendency to compactness and brevity, resulting in the occasional loss of epic breadth and fulness, and in the frequent interpolation of lines and longer passages, sometimes happy and sometimes not so. Besides, his conception of certain characters is not Homeric, and the Homeric epithets and formulae are frequently so changed as to be unrecognizable, perhaps because he desired to substitute variety of expression for the uniformity and repetitiousness of his original. Nevertheless, in spite of his waywardness, he has usually caught and reproduced the Homeric tone.

Hermann Breymann's paper, Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Mr. J. H. Albers, is a caustic review of an article by the latter in the *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Litteratur* for the year 1876.

Max Walter offers Contributions to Ralph Royster Doyster. The first question, whether Constance actually read the letter sent by Ralph, is decided by the author in the affirmative. The second, as to the song with which the play concludes, admits of a less positive answer, though the probabilities would seem to be in favor of that beginning

'Who so to marry a minion Wyfe,
Hath hadde good chaunce and happe.'

Finally, in considering the rôle of Mathew Merygreeke, Walter is led to the conclusion that he unites the characters of the Vice in the Moralities and the parasite of the Latin drama.

¹ See *American Journal of Philology*, IV 506.

R. Boyle has a long statistical article on Beaumont, Fletcher and Massinger, as supplementary to the tables published by Fleay in the Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society. The points of difference between the two critics are summed up at the beginning, and are, as the author himself admits, of minor importance.

H. Treutler publishes a long investigation, entitled *The Otinel Romance of the Middle Ages*. Of this there are two French versions, six Scandinavian, and one English, to say nothing of fragments and congeners. The relations of these versions to each other are made out as carefully as the material will admit. The tale, which belongs to the Carolingian cycle, originated in France, and was related in verse about the beginning of the 13th century. The original poem is lost, but the Norse *Karlamagnus-Saga* represents it with considerable accuracy. Two successive revisions of this French romance followed in course of time; from the first of these the English *Otuel* is derived, and from the second the two French versions still in existence.

Kölbing continues his *Minor Contributions to the Exegesis and Textual Criticism of English Poets*, from Vol. III (v. Am. J. Phil. II 547). In this number there are two comments, one upon *Piers the Plowman B* (Skeat's ed.) Passus V, v. 328, and the other upon Milton's *L'Allegro*, v. 117; in the first the phrase '*atte new faire*' is explained, and in the second Masson's note upon '*Towered cities please us then*' is confirmed.

The Book Notices contain a report by Felix Liebrecht on the *Folk-Lore Record*, Vol. III, Parts I, II, the most important notices being those upon *Cattkin*; the English and Irish *Peau d'Âne* and *Folk-Lore Traditions of historical events*. Besides, there are reviews of Zielke's *Sir Orfeo*, Hermann's *Weitere quellenmässige Beiträge zu Shakespeare's litterarischen Kämpfen* (described as a product of emmet-like industry, but almost unreadable), Danker's *Die Laut- und Flexionslehre der mittelhochdeutschen Denkmäler*, and Doehn's *Aus dem amerikanischen Dichterwald II*. The latter is continued from Vol. IV, and includes brief estimates of R. H. Dana, Whittier, Joaquin Miller, Bryant, Longfellow and Bayard Taylor, and a good translation of Longfellow's sonnets entitled *Divina Commedia*.

The department of *Lehr- und Übungsbücher für die englische Sprache* fills pp. 185-233, the *Programmschau* pp. 234-37, *Literary Notices* occupy pp. 238-41, *Miscellanea* pp. 242-94. The *Miscellanea* contain, among other matter, two notices of the Revised Version of the English Bible, a short obituary of Eduard Müller, the lexicographer, the schedule of University Lectures on English Philology, and the usual *Zeitschriftenschau*.

II.—Regel continues his examination of Chapman's translation of Homer, considering it now in its relation to English literature. A thoroughly artistic rendering of a foreign or ancient author has an independent value; it is the embodiment of novel conceptions in familiar guise; and it is of potent influence upon the vernacular idiom, upon contemporary and succeeding authors. Chapman's Homer is no exception. Its merits were recognized by Meres, Jonson, Browne, Drayton and Sheppard, and were so highly esteemed within a year after the publication of the first twelve books that whole lines were borrowed by Niccols for his *England's Eliza*. The encomiums of the Elizabethans have been echoed in our own times by such discriminating critics as Keats,

Godwin, Coleridge, and Swinburne. Chapman's language deserves special study. In many cases he has successfully imitated the compound epithets of Homer; by rescuing older words from oblivion and coining new ones he has materially increased and enriched the vocabulary of English. The grammatical peculiarities of his diction are shared with Shakespeare and other contemporaries. In the *Odyssey*, probably because he was favored by the metre, he exhibits a marked fondness for antithesis and epigrammatic point, in this respect anticipating Pope. His style was his own, English and not Greek. In the use of alliteration and verbal conceits Chapman is a true child of his age, while on the other hand he neglects the most tempting opportunities to introduce onomatopoeic verses. Now and then the language seems rather Scriptural than Homeric, though this is the fault of Spondanus and the other exegetes rather than that of our poet, and Cowper errs in this respect much more widely than Chapman. Inexact rimes are not uncommon; the proportion is about 19 per cent. of the whole; some of these are still in use, but not all. Of the nature of poetic licenses are his triplets, feminine or double rimes, and unrimed lines. The run-on lines of Shakespeare's later period occur also in Chapman, but only once does it lead to the division of a compound word between the end of one line and the beginning of the next. Other licenses and metrical peculiarities are the following: an extra syllable is allowed before a pause; a trochee is substituted for an iambus at the beginning of a line; elisions and contractions are frequent. There is considerable variety in the management of the secondary cæsuras. The article ends with a comparison of Cowper, Pope and Chapman as translators of Homer.

John Goodlet treats of Shakspeare's debt to John Lilly. The conclusions of the article, as summed up in the author's own words, are that "Lilly's style had no influence on Shakspeare's prose, but that he had evidently studied him lovingly, had taken up and developed his love of song, his pages and servants with their banter and jollity, and had benefited by the example of dramatic fusing of the serious and comic elements in Lilly's dramas. Finally, this influence is to be seen in a multitude of minute details of character, situation and expression, and is to be sought for principally in Shakspeare's early plays, such as *Love's Labours Lost*, *Twelfth Night*, *As You Like It*, and the *Midsummer Night's Dream*."

R. Boyle has a short paper on the application of metrical tests to *Pericles*.

F. H. Stratmann makes a few Minor Contributions to Middle English Grammar, and adds a note to his Middle English Dictionary, and several emendations of Middle English Authors, comprising *Lazamon*, *Havelok* and *Trevisa*.

Kölbing has a collation of *Dame Siriz*, containing but little of importance.

J. Wendt continues the Treatment of English Prepositions in the *Realschule* of the first class, from Vol. IV (*Am. J. Phil.* IV 505). The prepositions here considered are *on* and *to*.

The Book Notices have a continuation of the report on *The Folk-Lore Record* (Vol. IV) by Felix Liebrecht. The books reviewed are Storm's *Englische Philologie*, Wissmann's *Das Lied von King Horn*, Lewin's *Das mittelenglische Poema morale*, Landmann's *Der Euphuismus*, Hermann's *Mittheilungen über Shakspeare's litterarische Kämpfe*, and Doehn's *Beiträge zur*

Geschichte der nordamerikanischen Union. The analysis of Landmann's book contains much that is suggestive; that of Doe'n's has extracts from two speeches, one by Karl Schurz, and the other by Garfield.

Notices of Lehr- und Uebungsbücher für die englische Sprache and the Programmschau occupy pp. 425-58.

In the Miscellanea, with which the volume ends, is a reply by Schipper to a criticism of his Altenglische Metrik by Wissmann, the discussion turning upon the often mooted 'Zweihebungstheorie.'

ALBERT S. COOK.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von KARL BARTSCH. Wien, 1883-84. Neue Reihe, XVI Jahrgang.

Heft I.

To the many representations of the subject of Tristan and Isolde (cf. Bechstein, *Tristan*, p. xvi) a new and valuable one was lately added through the discovery in the church of Schwarzenberg, in the Saxon Erz mountains, of a piece of tapestry, upon which twenty-one incidents of the Tristan saga are embroidered. Herm. Dunger begins the first number with a description of this curious piece of needlework, and concludes that the particular legend which inspired the embroiderer must have been the old Volksbuch of 'Tristrant und Isalde' (Augsburg, 1498), a prose version of the poem of Eilhart von Oberg (1170). The embroidery has the date of 1539. So even that late incidents from the Tristan saga found favor with decorative art in Germany. Surely a clear indication of the long popularity among the German people of the legend—not the legend, however, in Gotfried v. Strassburg's glowing version, but in the simple poem of Eilhart v. Oberg. This is significant. Gotfried's great work was forgotten. Eilhart's "Tristan" formed the basis of a prose version as late as the 15th century.

Reinhold Köhler sends two communications: "In die Hand, nicht in Speisen schneiden," and "Der Fisch Celebrant." The former furnishes additional illustrations from various sources of a similar occurrence to that mentioned in some verses on King Ezel (cf. Köhler in Vol. XIV of the *Germania*), in which a beautiful maiden, suddenly entering the banquet hall of the King, so startles the steward, who is about to carve some viands, that instead of cutting them he cuts his hand. The second article discusses the origin of the name "Fisch Celebrant." K. conceives the word to be a corruption of *cete grande*, a mediaeval Latin appellation for the whale. *Cete grande* > *cetegrant* > *celebrant*. Wackernagel, *Altd. W.* 5th ed. has Gr. *L. chelydrus*, *L. coluber*, *colubra*? cf. Schade, *Altd. W.* p. 1242.

Under the title "Mythische Nachklänge," Vernaleken publishes a "Märchen" from the village of Göpfritz, in Lower Austria. It is one of the many variations of the well-known story of the three brothers who leave home to seek their fortunes. The youngest and the stupid of the family is of course the successful one in the end.

Edzardi follows with "Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erläuterung der Eddalieder." We note the following proposed changes in the order of strophes

and reading of the Hyndluljóð. Strophe 8 after 5 (5-8-6). Strophes 9 and 10 after 45. In strophe 45, the reading of the Flateyjarbók,

"Ber þú minis öl
Minum gelti!"

should be retained. Munch, Bugge and others alter to *gesti* = guest. The word *gelti* = boar refers to Ottar, transformed into a boar by Freyja to deceive Hyndla. In Hyndla's cave dwelling Ottar could hardly be a guest of Freyja. Simrock follows Bugge and translates *gast*. In reading Edzardi's article we could not but think of the loss the field of Germanistic studies has sustained. By his death, which occurred on the 6th of June, 1882, we are bereft of a ripe scholar of the clearest perception, the finest fancy, of sound judgment and close reasoning.

A. Billinger prints "Aufzeichnungen der Nonne Adelheid in Linnich" from a codex of the XV century, once in possession of the Franciscan convent at Linnich, and A. Bernouli supplies fragments of a "Trojanergedicht" from a MS of the Repgau chronicle in the public library of Basel. The fragments date from the middle of the XV century. The communication of Billinger is of special interest, as the dialect used in the "Aufzeichnungen" is that of Jülich—the boundary of the Middle and Low Frankish.

In the XXIII volume of the Germania, Bartsch contributed some fragments of a "Meisterlied über Kaiser Rothbarth," which he then supposed were entirely unknown. This was a mistake, for mention had been made of the verses in the Grundriss of K. Goedeke, who now publishes the entire poem. G. adds besides a number of "Meisterlieder" from MSS in the grand ducal library of Weimar, among them a "Tanhäuserlied," which seems to be older than any that treats of the legend, since it only knows of Tanhäuser's sin and repentance, but not yet of the miracle of the budding staff which was to assure his pardon.

K. G. Andresen has a list of family names derived from the stem *hrod*, *hruod* (cf. A. J. Phil. Vol. IV, p. 103), and C. Marold continues his article on the influence of the Latin upon the Gothic Bible translation (cf. A. J. Phil. Vol. II, p. 392). R. Springer furnishes emendations "zu Konrads von Heimesfurt Urstende," and H. Giske in an article "Zur Textkritik des Ezzoleichs" discusses the comparative merits for text-criticism of the two MSS of the Leich—the Voraue and the fragmentary version discovered and published in Strassburg, by K. A. Barack, in 1879. Both versions are evidently based upon the same MS, which once formed the last leaves of some larger work. The original of the verses of the Strassburg fragment was written on the back of the last leaf of the larger work, and together with it became by some accident detached from the following leaves, which contained the rest and larger number of strophes of the Ezzoleich. The parts passed finally into the hands of two different persons. The writer of the Voraue MS, who acquired the last leaves, being acquainted with the complete poem, now filled up the beginning from memory. This disposes of the Voraue MS for text-restoration of the commencement of the Leich, and shows the value of the Strassburg fragment. For a text approximating nearest to the original Giske places 21 emended strophes of the Voraue MS after the 7 strophes of the Strassburg MS.

Literature.—P. Piper reviews Oskar Erdmann's edition of "Otfried," published in Halle, 1882, and shows why the critical apparatus in this edition should be used with caution by students.

Karl Bartsch comments favorably upon K. F. Kummer's "Erlauerspiele from a MS of the XV century," Wien, 1882; and Felix Liebrecht continues his reviews of Era Wigström's *Folkdiktning*, Göteborg, 1881, and Eugène Rolland's "Faune populaire de la France" (cf. A. J. Phil. Vol. IV, pp. 103, 107).

The Miscellany contains the report of the 36th meeting of German philologists (deutsch-romanische section) in Karlsruhe, 1882; minor contributions from A. Hoffer and A. Czerny, "Zu Waldis' Fastnachtspiel," and "Segnung des Johannisweins"; letters from Jacob Grimm to Eduard Kausler (Assist. at the Royal Archives at Stutgard), from W. Grimm to Heinrich Rückert, and a panegyric on the late Prof. Anton Edzardi by E. Mogk.

Heft II.

No hero of the Round Table and the legends of Arthur became so generally an object of literary treatment, during the XIIth and XIIIth, and even the XIVth and XVth centuries, as Lancelot. The fortunes of fair Geneva and her lover found a willing ear at all times among the high-born of that day, already tainted by a voluptuous, moonshiny court-poetry so different from the heroic epics that told of Sigfried the Völsung and Charlemagne and his paladins. No wonder the writers availed themselves of the opportunity to please the taste of their princely patrons.

The different MSS extant of the Lancelot saga, and particularly its prose versions, is the subject of Arthur Peter's paper, "Die deutschen Prosaromane vom Lancelot." France stands foremost and earliest in literary activity with regard to the Lancelot romances. Chrestien de Troyes' epic (1190) is the oldest poetical work, while a large prose version, presumably of the XIII century, whose author has been variously stated as Gautier Map and Robert de Borron, but has been conclusively proved by Birch-Hirschfeld (*Sage v. Gral*) not to belong to either, forms the oldest prose-treatment of the subject. Of this version alone we have 40 MSS, of which 24 are in the National Library at Paris, the rest scattered in Italy, Germany, Denmark and England. Another Lancelot in verse, by Jehan, exists as a fragment in a single MS. Whether there ever was a Provençal Lancelot by the troubador Arnaut Daniel, as believed by some, has been seriously questioned by Gaston Paris and Conrad Hoffmann. Many French versions were no doubt lost, among them probably the original upon which the German Ulrich v. Zazikhoven based his "Lanzelet" (cf. A. J. of Phil. Vol. IV, p. 517). The great popularity which the "Lancelot" enjoyed in France is perhaps shown by the fact that at the time of the introduction of playing-cards in France (XV century), one of the knaves was dubbed Lancelot (cf. Liebrecht, in Dunlop's *History of Fiction*, p. 75). Other Romance nations have not been idle. We have 4 Italian, 2 Spanish and one Portuguese version. The oldest of these, in the Italian *Cento novelle antiche*, dates from the XIII century. Upon the field of Teutonic literature Germany furnishes the oldest Lancelot MS—Ulrich v. Zazikhoven's epic (1195)—which seems to represent a very old version of the story. Ulrich

Fütrér's poem in his "Buch der Abenteuer" was written about 1480. An imitation of the Lancelot story is contained in the poem "Wigamur," and besides these there are a number of prose versions of the XV and XVI centuries. A Middle-Dutch "Roman van Lancelot" was published by Jonckbloet in 1849. In English literature, the prose work of Thomas Malory, "The renowned, most ancient and famous history of the renowned Prince Arthur," tells of Lancelot. The Scottish fragment, "Lancelot of the Laik," is a versified translation from the French prose work, and the Welsh translation of the *Quete du St. Greal*, "Y seint Greal," likewise has the Lancelot story. In addition to these, versions of an English Lancelot ballad have come to us. In modern times Tennyson, W. Hertz, A. Böttger and Franz Bittong have treated the subject. Arthur Peter subjects the German prose versions to a close inspection, with the following result, which differs somewhat from the opinions of Goedeke and others (cf. *Grundriss*, I, p. 101): The German prose MSS of the Lancelot saga may be strictly divided into two groups which he names F and P. To the F (Fütrér's versions) belong two MSS; to the P group five MSS, three of the XV and two of the XVI century. P is based upon the large French prose work and F in turn derived from P. One version of the P-group—a paper MS at Donaueschingen—has used in its second part a MS of F. Ulrich Fütrér's poem in his "Buch der Abenteuer" has its source in an earlier prose work by himself.

Reinhold Köhler sends two minor communications "Zu einem Spruche Rumelants," and "Erbagast der aller Diebe meister ist."

E. Förstemann has a paper on the name "Thumilicus," in which he considers the etymologies of Grimm, Wackernagel and others regarding this name, hardly tenable. After showing that the last component *licus* (Teut. *liks*, *leiks*) has occurred in Teut. names of persons and families at all times, F. asks, "But what are we to do with the first component in Thumilicus? It surely would be strange if the names Thusnelda and Thumilicus, identical in the *Anlaut*, did not accord etymologically. Might not the son, as it was often the case, have inherited a part of his mother's name? Supposing we were to read ΘΟΥΝΕΑΙΚΟΣ instead of ΘΟΥΜΕΑΙΚΟΣ? Giant body, adj. giant-like, would be a suitable meaning of the name." Old Norse *purs* > Thurs(*inhilda*) > Thusnelda (cf. Grimm, *Geschichte d. d. Spr.*; Schade, *Altd. W.*; Weigand, *Deut. W.*)

R. Sprenger, "Zum Pfaffen Amis," calls attention to the translation of *stuol* in verse 1705:

"Und truoc im einen *stuol* mite
Nâch der bischove site."

Stuol does not refer to a *chair*, but to *stôl* = *stola*. There was a Bavarian form *stuol* = *stole* (cf. *Lexer*, II 1271; *Schmeller*, II 752).

E. Wülcker adds an article—certainly an excellent one—to the collection of essays discussing the influence of Dr. Luther in establishing the New High German as the language of the German people. The paper entitled "Luther's stellung zur Kursächsischen Kanzleisprache" was first read at the meeting of the German Philological Society, at Karlsruhe, in 1882. W. treats of the principal peculiarities of the "Laut- u. Flexionslehre" of the language used in

the records and documents of the imperial chancery under the emperors Maximilian and Charles V, and shows the influence of this dialect upon the chanceries of the electorates of Middle Germany and their influence in turn upon the "Schriftsprache." After discussing Luther's position towards the latter, W. comes to the result that the language of the imperial chancery gave the first impulse to the foundation of the modern "Schriftsprache" by influencing first the princely chanceries of the empire, especially those of the powerful electors in Middle Germany, and later the business language of other corporations till it became gradually the speech of the educated. Many dialectic peculiarities, however, still clung to the chanceries severally, and with them to the writers and printers, who were guided in their language by each immediate chancery. To bring order into this chaos it demanded a powerful authority, and this authority was found in Luther, whose language took hold upon all Germany, then almost entirely inclined towards Protestantism. As the same chancery, owing to the mixed personnel in its offices, often showed an unsettled usage, Luther took that speech of the Saxon chancery which approximated nearest the Middle German and developed it independently. It was therefore neither the language of the Saxon chancery nor that of the books, but Luther's own. What the Dr. thought of the authority of the chanceries in the premises may be gleaned from the preface to his translation of the Old Testament, where he says, "Es achtet auch niemand recht deutsch zu reden besonders die herrn canzeleien und die lumpenprediger und puppensreiber, die sich lassen dünken, sie haben macht deutsche sprache zu ändern," etc. To him Low Germany—that part of the Empire which most tenaciously clung to its mother-tongue—at last succumbed, and to him belongs the glory and the merit of having given in his sincere idiomatic German a basis for the recognized language of all the realm. The exposition of W.'s article is clear, and—the greatest of merit—interesting and suggestive.

Franz Garthaus, "Zur Spervogelfrage," dissents from the generally accepted view that the first 23 strophes taken up in Haupt's *Minnesang's Frühling* under Spervogel should be attributed to another and later minnesänger. The existing MSS point to but one writer of the strophes in MF. 25, 1-30-33 (51) and his name is Spervogel. Style, rhyme-talent, thought and views, as well as private circumstances as far as they can be recognized, are in the manner of and suit the same individual. The dissimilarity of the strophes finds its explanation in the period in which Spervogel wrote—a period when the older freedom of form changed rapidly to an exactness in versification never reached after that.

E. Weber gives the titles of some prints of the XVI century, and the Miscellany offers minor communications from Behagel and Bartsch, and an answer of Karl Bahder to Steinmeyer's criticism of the book "Deutsche Philologie im Grundriss."

Heft III.

Karl Bartsch, "Zu Priester Arnolds Juliane," submits notes and emendations on Schönbach's reading of the legend of St. Juliane. The poem was discovered by S. some time ago, and evidently belongs to the XII century. In a second contribution, Bartsch publishes a fragment of a Middle German

versified "Book of the Maccabees" of the same time. The MS, in possession of the Halberstadt gymnasium, dates from the XIII century, and corresponds with 1 Maccab. 13, 16-32.

The influence of the minstrel Friedrich v. Hausen (1197) upon the lyric poetry of mediaeval Germany is ably discussed by Reinhold Becker, the author of "Der altheimische Minnesang," Halle, 1882. In the existing controversy regarding the origin of the collections of Hausen's lyrics, B. sides in the main with Müllenhoff, who assumes three *liederbücher* (cf. Paul, Beiträge, II 345). The development of the poet, above all his versification, confirms Müllenhoff's theory. Only through this we are fully enabled to understand the literary position of the poet. We have, however, no guarantee of the completeness of the *liederbücher* (cf. Müllenhoff, Z. f. d. A. 14, 133). The contents and versification of the first "büchlein" show Hausen to stand at that time in no relation whatever to the purely native lyric poetry of eastern Germany (Austria). Gradually the two schools, the Romance, of which Hausen was the representative in Germany, and the native German, represented by the Austrian minstrels, exchange their best features, and Hausen becomes truly a German poet. In all the arts of dialectical representation he was the giver, but this gain was purchased by the Austrian poets at the cost of freshness and originality. In many instances he brought them new thoughts, but much that is found in both schools was not new to the Austrian poets. His influence, as regards versification, is small. The form of the strophe, the feminine rhyme, the change of arsis and thesis and alternate rhymes, the Austrian poets developed independently. As to the introduction of the trochee and some minor points coupled with his name, we are still in doubt (cf. Altheim. Minnesang, p. 128). Friedrich von Hausen was not epoch-making, it is true, but he certainly was the poet whose influence was paramount in effecting a blending of the Provençal and native lyric poetry, and in whose death, which occurred on the 6th of May, 1190, at Philomelium, the crusading army under Barbarossa lost a valiant knight and German literature a poet of unquestionable merit.

Fedor Bech sends "Wortformen auf -eze" in addition to those printed in the Germania, X 395, XIV 431 and XXII 240, and A. Birlinger publishes a fragment of a didactic poem copied from a MS of the XIV century in the royal archives at Coblenz. The language of the fragment points to the Middle Rhineland as its home.

E. Wilken continues his "Metrische Bemerkungen zur Skaldenpoesie" from the XXIV volume of the Germania. The great merit of Sievers' investigations in the premises is fully recognized by W. Starting, as they do, from the relatively safe basis of Skaldic versification—without ignoring the Edda poems—these researches may still be looked upon as the standard. Wilken, however, thinks that the relationship of the Norse to the other Old Germanic poetry has not been sufficiently recognized, and that the authority of the theoretical sources from the Old Norse time, especially of the commentary on Håttatal, has been considered of too little importance by the latest editor and annotator of the work, Th. Möbius. W. states his views at some length in a manner that it would be no paradox to say the value of the article is not appreciably diminished by the possibility of some of the arguments in it proving finally to be untenable.

G. Walpert offers a fragment from "Ulrich's von dem Türlin Wilhelm," which was discovered some time ago in the archives of Augsburg attached to the cover of a collection of papers. It dates from the beginning of the XIV century, and differs much in dialect and reading from the Cassel MS of Ulrich's poem.

The name "Arminius" is the subject of a paper by L. Schmidt. German philology has long ago demonstrated that Arminius and Hermann are two entirely different names, yet we still hear and read occasionally that the latter was corrupted by the Romans into the former. As we are at present enabled to tell with tolerable certainty the earlier forms of our names of the present day, we may conclude that the name *Hermann* at the beginning of our era was probably *Charjaman* (with initial *ch* like Cherusus and Chariomerus, son of Italicus, grand-nephew of Arminius, Dio Cass. ed. Dindorf 67, 5), a name for which the Romans would undoubtedly have written Chariomannus. The belief that the Romans corrupted German names has been shown to be wrong. Unlike the Greeks, they rather transmitted them to us fairly true. The endeavor to make Arminius a German name has likewise failed. The least objectionable explanation in this direction is that which places the name with *Irmin* (= Herman in Hermanfried, Hermanrich, etc.) But this could only be an abbreviation of Irminfried, for it is well known that the Germans rarely named persons after their gods literally (cf. Grimm, *Altdeut. Wälder*, I 287). As a surname, *Irmin* might stand for "general leader" of the Cheruscan confederation. Thus Irmin was originally a surname of the deity worshipped in common by the united tribes. Again, this would presume that at the time of Arminius the name Irmin was not used as the name of a god. It is, however, an important point in the explanation of the name Arminius that we are able to prove by a number of inscriptions the existence of a Roman gens Arminia. We know that foreigners, upon receiving Roman citizenship, usually took the praenomen and nomen of him through whose influence they had obtained it. May not the Cheruscan leader have received his citizenship and name through the gens Arminia? It was not unusual for Germans to bear Roman names; for instance Tacitus mentions Claudius Civilis, a leader of the Batavians. A further proof that Arminius is not the German name of the Cheruscan chief we have in the system of name-giving that prevailed among the ancient Teutons. As a rule the first syllable of the name of the parent occurs, perhaps somewhat modified, as the first component of the son's name, especially of the first-born. The genealogical tables of Germanic rulers furnish abundant examples of this; Theuderic-Theudibert, Gundioc-Gundobad, Weo-Weilo, Gelaris-Gelimer, Agilulf-Adalwald, Childeric-Chlodovec, etc. Frequently a correspondence of the second component would show the descent, thus: Genseric-Huneric, Ausprand-Segiprand, Godipert-Reginpert-Aripert, etc. The Cheruscan names of Arminius' own family fully exemplify the custom. The brother of Segestes was Segimerus, and Sesithankos was a son of the latter. Segimundus was a son of Segestes. No doubt the custom also extended to Segimerus' first-born, Arminius. The anlaut *Sig*, *Si*, *S*, or the final syllable *merus*, must have been common to the name of both father and son. Might not Arminius' name have been Sigfried—perhaps the Sigfried of the Nibelungen saga?

F. Neumann's paper, "Zur Geschichte des Wolddietrich," is devoted to an investigation of the development and history of the Ortnit-Wolddietrich saga in poesy (cf. Amer. Journ. of Philol. IV 103), and makes manifest the different layers and orders of tradition jumbled together in the story of Ortnit and Wolddietrich.

Oskar Böhme offers "Beiträge zur Alterbestimmung der in Weigands Wörterbuche enthaltenen N. H. D. Wortformen," and Reinhold Bechstein has an appreciative criticism of W. Sommer's prize essay "Metrik des Hans Sachs," Halle, 1882. In a postscript B. comments on the treatment the essay received at the hands of H. Paul (Litteraturblatt f. Germ. u. Rom. Philo. IV, 1883) and expresses his astonishment at the violence of P.'s criticism.

Felix Liebrecht continues his review of "Faune populaire de la France," by E. Rolland, and Dr. Widmann and K. v. Bahder send some minor matter. Among the obituary notices of 1883 are those of Profs. M. Rapp, Lorenz Diefenbach and Alois Vaniček.

Heft IV.

Fedor Bech has "Kleine Beiträge" to Seifrid Helbling, Herm. v. Sachsenheim, Vaterbuch (ed. C. Franke), and the Old German versified paraphrase of the book of Job (ed. Mueller).

O. Böhme's "Beiträge zur Alterbestimmung N. H. D. Wortformen" are continued from the last number. We note *werden*. This verb is the only one of its class that preserved the *u* in the plural pret. indic., and this *u* also imposed itself upon the radical of the first and third persons of the singular, *ich, er wurde* or *wurd*. Weigand in his Deut. Wörterb. places the first use of these forms in the XVI century and cites Hans Sachs. Weinhold in his Bair. Gramm. §267 likewise quotes Sachs, who, besides *wur(d)* (*wür = würde*), wrote *verbund, fund, drung, zwung* for *wurde, verbunde*, etc. This fluctuating of the vowel, or rather this changing between the indic. and subj. form, is, however, found much earlier than the XVI century with this class of verbs (double liquids or liquid + mute). Kehrein, Gramm. XV, XVI century, I §351, prints examples from the XV century, and Weinhold, M. H. D. Gramm. §333, from even an earlier time (cf. Lexer, 3, 755).

J. Feige awards high praise to Josef Jireček's new critical edition of the German translation of the Bohemian poem "Dalimil" (fontes rerum bohemicarum tom. 3). After a careful study of this text, F. concludes that the translation was made between the years 1330-42 and that the translator was a native of Northwest Bohemia.

Hohenbühel-Heufler prints some couplets of the XVI century discovered by him on an estate near the city of Hall in Austria. The verses were written on the wall of a room from which the old white-wash had been removed.

F. Pfaff sends a small poem of the XVI century taken from a leaf attached to an historical work now in possession of the University library at Freiburg, and Felix Liebrecht reviews Svenska Folk-sagor, samlade och berättade af August Bondeson, Stockholm.

A list of recent publications on the field of Germanic philology, compiled by the editor Karl Bartsch, closes the fourth number.

C. F. RADDATZ.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Blackburn (F. A.) *The essentials of Latin Grammar.* Ginn, Heath & Co. 12mo. \$1.10.

Murray (Ja. A. H., ed.) *A new English dictionary on historical principles, founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society, edited by Ja. A. H. Murray, LL. D., with the assistance of many scholars and men of science.* Pt. 1, A-Ant. Macmillan. 4to. pap., net, \$3.25.

BRITISH.

Aristotle. By George Grote. Edited by Alexander Bain and G. C. Robertson. 3d ed. 8vo, 688 pp. Murray. 12s.

Bleekly (H.) *Socrates and the Athenians: An Apology.* Post 8vo, 70 pp. Paul, Trench & Co. 2s. 6d.

Cust (R. N.) *A Sketch of the Modern Languages of Africa. Accompanied by a Language Map. (Trübner's Oriental Series.)* 2 vols. 8vo, 570 pp. Trübner. 25s.

Homer. *Iliad.* With a verse-translation by W. C. Green. Vol. 1, Books 1-12. Cr. 8vo. Longmans. 6s.

Maori. *Te Pukapuka O Nga Inoi: The Book of Common Prayer in the Maori Language.* 16mo, bd. S. P. C. K. 2s. 6d.

Martial, *Extracts from.* With an Introduction by W. Y. Sellar. Post 8vo, 228 pp. Thin (Edinburgh). Simpkin. 3s. 6d.

Muir (J.) *Original Sanskrit Texts on the Origin and History of the People of India.* Vol. 5, 3d ed. 8vo, 470 pp. Trübner. 21s.

Otté (E. C.) *A Simplified Grammar of the Danish Language.* Post 8vo, 66 pp. Trübner. 2s. 6d.

Pindar, *Extant Odes of.* Translated into English, with an Introduction and Short Notes, by Ernest Myers. 2d ed. Post 8vo, 162 pp. Macmillan. 5s.

Redhouse (J. W.) *A Simplified Grammar of the Ottoman-Turkish Language.* Post 8vo, 216 pp. Trübner. 10s. 6d.

Virgil, *Works of.* Translated into English verse, with Variorum and other Notes and Comparative Readings, by J. Augustine Wilstach. 2 vols. Illust. 8vo, 1222 pp. Boston. 25s.

Whitney (William Dwight). *Language and the Study of Language.* 4th ed. Augmented by an analysis. Post 8vo, 596 pp. Trübner. 10s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Beaudouin (Mondry). *Étude du dialecte chypriote moderne et médiéval.* Gr. in-8. Thorin. 5 fr.

- Bloch (G.) Les origines du sénat romain. Paris, 1884. 8vo, vii, 334 pp.
- Deltour (F.) Histoire de la littérature grecque. In-12. *Delagrave*. 3 fr. 75.
- Hervieux (Léopold). Les Fabulistes latins depuis le siècle d'Auguste jusqu'à la fin du moyen âge. Phèdre et ses anciens imitateurs directs et indirects. Tomes I et II. 2 vol. gr. in-8. *F. Didot*. 30 fr.
- Lafaye (G.) Histoire du culte des divinités d'Alexandrie, etc. Sérapis, Isis, Harpocrate et Anubis hors de l'Égypte. Paris, 1884. 8vo, 342 pp. Mit Taf.
- Le Hericher (E.) Glossaire germanique, scandinave et hébraïque des noms d'hommes français et anglais. In-8. (Avranches.) *Maisonneuve*. 2 fr. 50.
- Willems (A.) Notes et corrections sur l'Hippolyte d'Euripide. Bruxelles, 1884. 8vo, 74 pp.

GERMAN.

- Abel (Eug.) Scholia in Pindari Epinicia, ad librorum manuscriptorum fidem ed. E. A. Vol. II. Fasc. 1. Scholia vetera in Pindari Nemea et Isthmia continens. gr. 8, 160 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 5.
- Anagnostopulos (Georgius). Περὶ τῆς λατινικῆς ἐπιτομῆς τοῦ Βαρβάρου. Diss. gr. 8, 40 S. Jena, *Pohle*. m. 1.
- Anonymi de situ orbis libri II. E codice Leidensi nunc primum ed. Max. Manitius. gr. 8, xv, 97 S. Stuttgart, *Cotta*. m. 5.
- Ballas (Emil). Grammatica Plautina. Specimen I et II. Ed. II. gr. 8 u. gr. 4, 50 u. 11 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 2.
- Baudouin de Courtenay (Prof. Dr. J.) Übersicht der slavischen Sprachenwelt im Zusammenhange m. den andern arioeuropäischen [indogermanischen] Sprachen. Antrittsvorlesung, geh. an der Universität Dorpat am 6-18 Septbr. 1883. gr. 8, 21 S. Leipzig, *T. O. Weigel*. m. —60.
- Bender (Rekt. Dr.) Üb. die Aussprache d. Lateinischen. Vortrag auf der Lehrer-Versammlg. d. Donaukreises, 1883. [Aus "Correspondenzbl. f. d. württ. Gelehrten- u. Realschulen."] gr. 8, 11 S. Tübingen, *Fues*, 1883. m. —40.
- Bergk (Thdr.) Beiträge zur römischen Chronologie. Hrsg. v. Gust. Hinrichs. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 84 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.
- Biese (Dr. Alfr.) Die Entwicklung d. Naturgefühls bei den Griechen u. Römern. 2 Tl. A. u. d. T.: Die Entwickl. d. Naturgefühls bei den Römern. gr. 8, vi, 210 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 4. (cplt. m. 7.)
- Bludau (Alois). De fontibus Frontini. Diss. gr. 8, 44 S. Brunsbergae, 1883. Königsberg, *Beyer*. m. 1.20.
- Brugsch (H.) Thesaurus inscriptionum aegyptiacarum. 3 abth.: Geographische Inschriften altägyptischer Denkmäler. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* 1884. 4to, vii u. p. 531-618. m. 22.
- Carstens (Dr. Broder). Zur Dialectbestimmung d. mittelenglischen Sir Firumbras. Eine Lautuntersuchg. gr. 8, 40 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.20.
- Cauer (Frdr.) De fabulis graecis ad Romam conditam pertinentibus. gr. 8, 35 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 2.

Cohn (Leop.) Untersuchungen üb. die Quellen der Plato-Scholien. [Aus "Jahrbb. f. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 94 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Cornelii Nepotis vitae. Scholarum in usum rec. et emendavit Andr. Weidner. 8vo, iv, 104 S. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. —60.

Delitzsch (F.) Die Sprache der Kossäer. Linguistisch-historische Funde und Fragen. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* 1884. 8vo, vi, 75 pp. m. 10.

Ephemeris epigraphica corporis inscriptionum latinarum supplementum edita jussu instituti archaeologici romani cura G. Henzeni, Th. Mommseni, J. B. Rossii. Vol. V. Fasc. 1 et 2. gr. 8, 262 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 7.20.

Euting (Jul.) Sammlung der carthagischen Inschriften. I Bd. Taf. 1-202 und Anhang, Taf. 1-6. 4to. 1 Bl. Text. Strassburg, *Trübner*, 1883. m. 60.

Fehleisen (Geo.) Zur Rettung d. Tacitus. [Aus "Correspondenzbl. f. d. württ. Gelehrten- u. Realschulen."] gr. 8, 15 S. Tübingen, *Fues*, 1881. m. —40.

Flach (Hans). Württemberg u. die Philologie. 2 veränd. Aufl. gr. 8, 31 S. Stuttgart, *Metzler's Verl.* m. —60.

Friederici (Ch.) Bibliotheca orientalis. 8 Jahrg. gr. 8, 83 S. Leipzig, *O. Schulze*. cart. m. 3.50.

Fritze (L.) Panschatantra. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt. Leipzig, *O. Schulze*, 1884. 8vo, xi, 405 pp. m. 6.

Gaumnitz (Herm.) Zu den Bobienser Ciceroscholien. gr. 4, 30 S. Dresden, *v. Zahn & Jaensch*. m. 1.35.

Geldner (K. F.) Drei Yasht aus dem Zendavesta, übersetzt und erklärt, Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*, 1884. 8vo, xvi, 143 pp. m. 5.

Giesing (Frdr.) De scholiis Platonis quaestiones selectae. Pars I: De Aeli Dionysi et Pausaniae Atticistarum in scholiis fragmentis. Diss. gr. 8. 72 S. m. 1 Tab. Leipzig, *Fock*, 1883. m. 1.20.

Harwardt (Max.) De Aristophanis irrisationibus earumque fide et usu. Part I. Diss. gr. 8, 69 S. Königsberg, *Beyer*, 1883. m. 1.20.

Heiberg (J. L.) Philologische Studien zu griechischen Mathematikern. [Aus "Jahrbb. f. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 37 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.

Hermes. Zeitschrift f. class. Philologie, hrsg. v. Geo. Kaibel u. Carl Robert. 19 Bd. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 164 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 12.

Herzog (E.) Geschichte u. System der römischen Staatsverfassung. 1 Bd. Königszeit u. Republik. gr. 8, lxiii, 1188 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 15.

Homeri Iliadis carmina sejuncta, discreta, emendata, prolegomenis et apparatu critico instructa ed. Guil. Christ. Pars I. gr. 8, iv, 398 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 8.

Hoyer (Rud.) De Antiocho Ascalonita. Diss. gr. 8, 52 S. Bonn, *Behrendt*, 1883. m. 1.20.

Jellinghaus (Hm.) Zur Einteilung der niederdeutschen Mundarten. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*, 1884. 8vo, xvi, 84 pp. m. 2.40.

Jordan (Heinr.) Quaestiones archaeicae. gr. 4, 13 S. Königsberg, *Hartung*. m. 1.50.

Jütting (Sem.-Dir. Dr. W.) Essays üb. deutsche u. fremde Wörter m. harten u. weichen Verschlusslauten. gr. 8, xvi, 291 S. Wittenberg, *Herrosé Verl.* m. 3.50.

Juvenalis et Persii fragmenta Bobiensia edita a Geo. Goetz. gr. 4, 10 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. —70.

Kaerst (J.) Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte d. 2 Samniterkrieges. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 47 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.20.

Klinger (Geo.) De decimi Livii libri fontibus. Diss. gr. 8, 70 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.

Krall (Jak.) Studien zur Geschichte d. alten Aegypten. II, Aus demot. Urkunden. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 100 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.60. (I u. II, m. 2.80.)

Köpken (Jul.) De theatro attico saeculi a. Chr. quinti. gr. 8, 32 S. m. 1 eingedr. Grundriss. Bonn, *Behrendt*. m. 1.

Kraut. Üb. den Stil d. Livius m. besond. Rücksicht auf die livianische Syntax. Vortrag, geh. in der Lehrerversammlg. zu Ravensburg, 28 Juli, 1882. [Aus "Correspondenzbl. f. d. württ. Gelehrten- u. Realschulen."] gr. 8, 13 S. Tübingen, *Fues*, 1882. m. —40.

Kühn (Carl.) De Batrachomyomachia, observationes criticae. Diss. gr. 8, 52 S. Königsberg, *Beyer*, 1883. m. 1.20.

Lexikon, Ausführliches, der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie, im Verein m. Th. Birt, O. Crusius, R. Engelmann, etc., unter Mitred. v. Th. Schreiber, hrsg. v. W. H. Roscher. Mit zahlreichen Abbildgn. (In 17-20 Lfgn.) 1 u. 2 Lfg. Lex.-8, Sp. 1-352. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.

Luebbert (Ed.) Diatriba in Pindari locum de Adrasti regno Sicyonio. gr. 4, 22 S. Bonn, *Cohen & Son.* m. 1.

— Commentatio de Pindaro Clithenis Sicyonii institutorum censore. gr. 4, 18 S. Bonn, *Cohen & Sohn.* m. 1.

Luecke (Hm.) Observationes criticae in historiam veteris Graecorum comoediae. I. De comoediae licentia legibus coercita. II. De Aristophanis cum aequalibus poetis comicis amicitia et similitudine. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1883. 8vo, 59 pp. m. 1.20.

Matzat (Heinr.) Römische Chronologie. 2 Bd. Römische Zeittafeln von 506 bis 219 v. Chr. gr. 8, viii, 424 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 8.

Mueller (Lucian). Luciliana. gr. 8, 24 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 1.20.

Novák (J. V.) Platon u. die Rhetorik. Eine philolog. Studie. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 100 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1883. m. 2.40.

Olsen (Waldem.) Quaestionum Plautinarum de verbo substantivo specimen. Diss. gr. 8, 105 S. Gryphiswaldiae. Jena, *Pohle*. m. 1.50.

Opitz (Thdr.) In Julio Floro spicilegium criticum. gr. 4, 24 S. Dresden, v. *Zahn & Jaensch*. m. 1.

Paucker (C.) Supplementum lexicorum latinorum. Fasc. 4. gr. 8, S. 289-384. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 3.

Petersdorff (R.) Eine neue Hauptquelle d. Q. Curtius Rufus. gr. 8, iii, 64 S. Hannover, *Hahn*. m. 2.

Plato's ausgewählte Dialoge. Erklärt v. C. Schmelzer. 7 Bd. Der Staat. 1 abtlg. gr. 8, 203 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 2.10. (I-VII, 1, m. 9.50.)

Plauti (T. Macci). Comoediae. Rec., instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit Frdr. Ritscheli socii operae adsumptis Gust. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell. Tomi II, fasc. 5. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 5.

Plutarch's Themistokles f. quellenkrit. Übgn. commentiert u. hrsg. v. Dr. Adf. Bauer. gr. 8, iv, 104 S. m. 2 Tab. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.

Reading book in the Gā or Akra language. 8, viii, 148 S. m. eingedr. Holzschn. u. 2 Holzschn. Basel, *Missionsbuchh.* 1883. cart. m. 1.60.

Rösch (W.) Üb. den griechischen Accent. Vortrag auf der Lehrerversammlung. in Hall 13 Mai, 1882. [Aus "Correspondenzbl. f. d. württ. Gelehrten- u. Realschulen."] gr. 8, 17 S. Tübingen, *Fues*, 1882. m. —50.

Saalfeld (E. A.) Die Lautgesetze der griechischen Lehnwörter im Lateinischen, nebst Hauptkriterien der Entlehnung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung. gr. 8, xi, 131 S. Leipzig, *C. F. Winter*. m. 2.

— Haus und Hof in Rom im Spiegel griechischer Kultur. Kulturgeschichtliche Beiträge. 8vo, vii, 274 pp. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*, 1884. m. 4.

Schinkel (Jul.) Quaestiones Silianae. Diss. gr. 8, 77 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Schubert (Rud.) Geschichte der Könige v. Lydien. gr. 8, 132 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 3.

Seemann (O. S.) Üb. den Ursprung der Sprache. (Vortrag.) 8, 33 S. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. —50.

Seume (Hm.) De sententiis consecutivis Graecis. 8vo, 66 pp. Göttingen, *Peppmüller's Verl.* 1883. m. 1.

Sophoclis Electra, scholarum in usum ed. Frdr. Schubert. 8, xviii, 49 S. Prag, *Tempsky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. —40.

Stobaei (Joa.) Anthologium, recensuerunt Curt Wachsmuth et Otto Hense. Vol. I et II. Libri duo priores, qui inscribi solent eclogae physicae et ethicae, rec. Curt Wachsmuth. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 18.

Strack (Hm. L.), und Siegfried (C.) Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache und Litteratur. 8vo. Karlsruhe, *Reuther*, 1884. m. 3.

— Altitalische Studien. Herausgegeben von C. Pauli. 2 Hft. 8vo, 148 pp. Mit 5 lith. Taf. Hannover, *Hahn*, 1883. m. 8.

Tabelle zur sanskritischen Deklination u. Konjugation. Fol. 4 lith. S. Dorpat, *Krüger*. m. —80.

Taciti (P. Cornelii). Opera quae supersunt, atque interpretatus est Jo. Casp. Orellius. Vol. II, ed. II. Fasc. 4. Historiarum liber I, ed. Carolus Meiser. gr. 8, S. 223–308. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 4.50.

Zingerle (Osw.) Ueber eine Handschrift des Passionalis und Buches der Märtyrer. 8vo, 110 pp. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*, 1883. m. 1.80.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aeschyli Agamemno. Emendavit David S. Margoliouth. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1884.

Allen (W. F.) History Topics for High Schools and Colleges. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1883. 25c.

Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik. Erster Jahrg. Heft 2. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1884.

Bartholdi Statue, Official Engraving of. Traveller's Ins. Co. Hartford, Conn.

Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum edita curantibus Joanne Kvičala et Carolo Schenkl. Prague, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, 1883.

C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico, ed. Ignatius Prammer. 1m. 50pf.

Q. Horati Flacci Carmina, ed. Michael Petschening. 1m. 20pf.

P. Ovidi Nasonis. Metamorphoses edd. Sedlmayer, Zingerle, Güthling. 85kr.

Fasti, ed. Güthling. 75pf.

Carmina Selecta, ed. Sedlmayer. 80pf.

C. Sallusti Crispi. Bellum Catilinae, Bellum Iugurthinum. 1m.

Sophoclis Ajax, ed. Schubert. 40pf.

— Antigone, ed. Schubert. 40pf.

— Oedipus Rex, ed. Schubert. 40pf.

Blackburn (F. A.) The Essentials of Latin Grammar. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1883. \$1.40.

Browne (Geo. H.) Notes on Shakspeare's Pronunciation. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. 30c.

Burgess (J. W.) The American University. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1882.

Church (A. J.) Stories of the Old World. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. 40c.

Descriptiones nobilissimorum apud classicos locorum ed. Albert v. Kampen. Series I, Quindecim ad Caesaris de Bello Gallico commentarios tabulae. Gotha, *Justus Perthes*, 1883. 1m. 60pf.

English Dictionary (A New), on Historical Principles. Founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by James A. H. Murray, LL. D., President of the Philological Society, with the assistance of many scholars and men of science. Part I, A-ANT. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. London, *Henry Frowde*, Amen Corner, 1884. 12s. 6d.

Gheyn (J. van d.) Note sur la 8e classe des verbes sanscrits. Première série. Bruxelles, *F. Hayez*, 1880.

— Remarques sur quelques racines sanscrites de la huitième classe. Deuxième série. Bruxelles, *F. Hayez*, 1884.

— Le Yigdhel et le Yagnoli. Études sur deux dialectes de l'Asie centrale. Bruxelles, *F. Hayez*, 1883.

— Cerbère. Étude de mythologie comparée. Bruxelles, *A. Vromant*, 1883.

Gizyaki (Paul v.) *Einleitende Bemerkungen zu einer Untersuchung über den Wert der Naturphilosophie des Epikur.* Berlin, *R. Gärtner*, 1884.

Hall (Isaac H.) *Syriac Manuscript Gospels of a Pre-Harklensian Version. Acts and Epistles of the Peshitto Version.* Written (probably) between 700 and 900 A. D., by the Monk John. Presented to the Syrian Protestant College by 'Adb ul-Messiah of Mardin. (Phototyped specimen pages.)

Hebraica. A Monthly Journal in the interests of Hebrew Study. Managing Editor: W. R. Harper; Associate Editors: H. L. Stark, Paul Haupt. Chicago, *Morgan Park*. \$2 per 10 numbers.

Höpken (Julius). *De Theatro Attico saeculi a. Chr. quinti.* Bonnae, *C. Georg*, 1883.

Hornung (A.) *Zur Geschichte des lateinischen C vor E. u. I im Romanischen.* Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1883.

Keller (O.) *Der Saturnische Vers als rythmisch erwiesen.* Prag, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1884.

Monro (D. B.) *On the Fragment of Proclus' abstract on the Epic Cycle contained in the Codex Venetus of the Iliad.* Reprinted from the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 1883.

Palliser's Useful Details. Bridgeport, Conn., *Palliser, Palliser & Co.* \$3.

Paul (H.) *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik.* 2te Auflage. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1884. 2m. 6pf.

Robinson (J. Barr). *The Confederate States and Private Southern Debts.* London, *Waterlow & Co.* 1s.

Stangl (Thos.) *Der sogenannte Gronovscholiast zu elf Ciceronischen Reden. Ueberlieferung, Text u. Sprache.* Prag, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1883.

BRIEF MENTION.—Professor Ellis's lecture on *Maximianus*, which appears in this number, was delivered in the New Schools at Oxford, March 5.

The Baltimore Type Foundry (Messrs. Chas. J. Cary & Co.) have added to their large assortment a font of "Lachmann" Greek, and a font of Arabic type, the matrices of which were made by Mr. Samuel Hallock, who cut the famous *Beyrût Arabic*—specimens of which are subjoined. The Editor of this Journal, who has done everything in his power to encourage this enterprise, cannot refrain from expressing the hope that the effort will find a cordial response from American scholars and publishers. Typographical nonage is a confession of philological nonage.

The Arabic poem, selected by Dr. A. L. Frothingham, is by the famous pre-Islamic poet Imru'luqais.

For the Greek, a few verses have been taken from the ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ, which has excited so much attention of late and has elicited so much extemporized Greek scholarship. It is needless to say that one charm of this character is the way in which it works with the Roman type, and the abandonment of it in the reproductions of Lachmann's *Lucretius* shows a sad falling off in typographical effect.

امروء القيس

- ١ يَا لَهَبَ هُنْدٍ إِذْ خَطُنَ كَاهِلًا
 ٢ أَلْقَانِيلِينَ أَلْبَلَّكَ الْمُحْلَا حِلًّا
 ٣ خَيْرَ مَعَدٍّ حَسَبًا وَنَائِلًا
 ٤ وَخَيْرَ مُرٍّ قَدْ عَلِمُوا شِمَاءًا
 ٥ نَأَى اللَّهُ لَا يَذْهَبُ شَيْخِي بَاطِلًا
 ٦ نَحْنُ جَلَبْنَا الْفُرَجَ الْقَوَافِلًا
 ٧ نَحْمِلُنَا وَالْأَسْلَ النَّوَاهِلًا
 ٨ وَحَى صَعْبٍ وَالْوَشِيعَ الذَّابِلًا
 ٩ مُسْتَفْرَمَاتٍ بِالْحَصَى جَوَافِلًا
 ١٠ يَسْتَشْرِفُ الْأَوَاخِرُ الْأَوَائِلًا

Ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδὸς ἐστὶν αὕτη· πρῶτον πάντων πονηρά ἐστι καὶ κατάρως μεστή· φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, ἐπιθυμίαι, πορνείαι, κλοπαί, εἰδωλολατρεῖαι, μαγεῖαι, φαρμακεῖαι, ἄρπαγαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, ὑποκρίσεις, διπλοκαρδία, δόλος, ὑπερηφανία, κακία, ἀγῥάδεια, πλεονεξία, αἰσχρολογία, ζηλοτυπία, θρασύτης, ὕψος, ἀλαζονεία· διώκεται ἀγαθῶν, μισοῦντες ἀλήθειαν, ἀγαπῶντες ψεῦδος, οὐ γινώσκοντες μισθὸν δικαιοσύνης, οὐ κολλῶμενοι ἀγαθῷ οὐδὲ κρίσει δίκαιῃ, ἀγρυπνοῦντες οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ πονηρόν· ὧν μακρὰν πραγῆς καὶ ὑπομονή, μάταια ἀγαπῶντες, διώκοντες ἀνταπόδομα, οὐκ ἐλεοῦντες πτωχόν, οὐ πονοῦντες ἐπὶ καταπονομένῳ, οὐ γινώσκοντες τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτοῦς, φονεῖς τέκνων, φθορεῖς πλάσματος θεοῦ, ἀποστρεφόμενοι τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, καταπονοῦντες τὸν θλιβόμενον, πλουσίων παράκλητοι, πενήτων ἄνομοι κριταί, πανθαμάρτητοι· ῥυθθεῖντε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων.

P. 33, four lines from bottom, for "north and northeast," read "south and southeast."